

CA1
CC
-75D11

Data Book
on Aspects of Language Demography
in Canada

for

Conference on the
Individual, Language and Society
Kingston, November 1975

John DeVries and
Frank G. Vallee

Department of Sociology
Carleton University



D A T A B O O K
on Aspects of Language Demography
in Canada


for

Conference on the
INDIVIDUAL, LANGUAGE AND SOCIETY
Kingston, November 1975

by

John DeVries and
Frank G. Vallee

Department of Sociology
Carleton University



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761114654874>

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

Introduction	ii
Part A: Census Data on Immigrant Languages and Problems Inherent to Census Data	1
Part B: Native Language Data	42
Part C: Official Language Data	58

INTRODUCTION

A complete DATA BOOK on the topic of language, the individual and society would be an inventory of findings and research from the many branches of scholarship for which language is an important datum or variable - ethno-linguistics, psycho-linguistics, socio-linguistics, language policy, and so on. Such a vast undertaking was not commissioned by the Consultative Group on the Individual, Language and Society (CGILS) and the Development Committee. What was called for was some basic information on 'standard' languages (les langues) in Canada rather than on the 'verbal repertoire' (la parole) which includes language codes (such as dialects and jargon) other than the standard ones.

Given the short period at our disposal, we decided that we could do little more than provide information on selected demographic features of ethnicity and language in Canada based on reports of Statistics Canada, with summaries from other sources.

The Data Book is divided in three parts, consisting of two kinds of information: data on trends in language and ethnicity, and notes on the advantages and limitations of Census data. We provide descriptive rather than analytical materials. And we concentrate on providing cross-tabulations for units like selected regions and metropolitan areas, many of which are not provided in published Census volumes. There are reports, such as Perspective Canada (Statistics Canada, 1974) which present summary figures on general patterns and trends in a very attractive format for Canada as a whole and for Provinces, and we saw no point in simply duplicating all of these widely available materials.

PART A

CENSUS DATA ON IMMIGRANT LANGUAGES
AND
PROBLEMS INHERENT TO CENSUS DATA

LANGUAGE-RELATED QUESTIONS IN THE 1971 CENSUS OF POPULATION

Four questions were asked which may be used in the analysis of the linguistic characteristics of the Canadian population:

1. ETHNIC GROUP

Respondents were asked: "To what ethnic or cultural group did you or your ancestor (on the male side) belong on coming to this continent?"

As the Census publication indicates:

"If applicable, the language spoken at that time by the person or by his or her paternal ancestor was used as a guide in determining the person's ethnic group"
(Bulletin 1.3-2, page 2)

It should be noted that the linguistic criterion does not apply to several of the ethnic groups enumerated in the Census, e.g. Austrian, Belgian, Jewish, Negro, West Indian.

Aside from this, the "ethnic group" variable is the least useful variable in the study of Canada's language demography for several additional reasons:

- a) Several groups have, over time, displayed fluctuations on size which cannot be explained by the common demographic processes of immigration, natality and fertility (e.g. Germans, Austrians, Ukrainians);
- b) Several groups have settled in Canada so long ago that ethnic group membership does not provide any information about the group's language characteristics (e.g. German settlements in Nova Scotia);
- c) The categories accepted in the Census of Population are not mutually exclusive. This reduces the reliability of the information for several of the ethnic groups (e.g. Jewish-Polish, Belgian-French, Negro-West Indian).

2. MOTHER TONGUE

Respondents were asked to indicate the language they first learned in childhood and which they still understand. In the case of infants, "mother tongue" is taken to be the language most often spoken in the home.

Obviously, the linguistic "content" of this question is somewhat higher than that of the preceding one. The two characteristics of the question are: the language must be the one first learned in the respondent's childhood (and, therefore, probably the language most often spoken by his parents), and it must still be understood by the respondent. There are, obviously, difficulties if the respondent is not able to understand the language which he first learned in childhood (he would literally not have a mother tongue) or if he learned two or more language simultaneously (the question does not allow for multiple answers). Finally, the requirement that the respondent still understand the language is of course only a necessary condition for his present use of the language, not a sufficient one.

3. HOME LANGUAGE

Respondents were asked to indicate the language presently being used most frequently in his or her home. This is obviously the only question dealing specifically with present language use, although it is restricted to only one "domain": the home. Thus, the Census has no information about the language spoken most often at work, at school, at church, at play.

4. OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Respondents were asked: "Can you speak English or French well enough to conduct a conversation?" Although the question obviously deals with current linguistic ability, it does not measure current language usage. Furthermore, individual interpretations of what is meant by "conducting a conversation" might vary from buying a loaf of bread in the Supermarket to having polite discussions about the state of the economy at cocktail parties.

Before getting into problems of Census data, validity and reliability, we present a set of tables that show the distribution of the major ethnic and language categories (excluding the Native peoples, to be discussed separately) and a few cross-tabulations on ethnicity and language data: Tables A-1 to A-11.

TABLE A-1

ETHNIC GROUPS WITH AT LEAST 100,000 PERSONS, CANADA, 1971 (Excluding Indian and Eskimo)			MOTHER TONGUE GROUPS, FOR WHICH THE CORRESPONDING ETHNIC GROUP HAS AT LEAST 100,000 MEMBERS, CANADA, 1971 (Excluding Indian and Eskimo)			HOME LANGUAGE GROUPS, FOR WHICH THE CORRESPONDING ETHNIC GROUP HAS AT LEAST 100,000 MEMBERS, CANADA, 1971 (Excluding Indian and Eskimo)		
Ethnic Group	Size	% of Total	Mother Tongue	Size	% of Total	Home Language	Size	% of Total
British Isles	9,624,120	44.6	English	12,973,810	60.2	English	14,446,235	67.0
French	6,180,120	28.7	French	5,793,650	26.9	French	5,546,025	25.7
German	1,317,200	6.1	German	561,085	2.6	German	213,350	1.0
Italian	730,820	3.4	Italian	538,360	2.5	Italian	425,230	2.0
Ukrainian	580,660	2.7	Ukrainian	309,855	1.4	Ukrainian	144,755	0.7
Netherlands(=Dutch)	425,945	2.0	Netherlands(=Dutch)	144,925	0.7	Netherlands(=Dutch)	36,170	0.2
Polish	316,430	1.5	Polish	134,780	0.6	Polish	70,960	0.3
Jewish	296,945	1.4	Yiddish	49,890	0.2	Yiddish	26,330	0.1
Norwegian	179,290	0.8	Norwegian	27,405	0.1	Norwegian	2,160	0.0
Hungarian	131,890	0.6	Hungarian (Magyar)	86,835	0.4	Hungarian (Magyar)	50,670	0.2
Greek	124,475	0.6	Greek	104,455	0.5	Greek	86,825	0.4
Chinese	118,815	0.6	Chinese	94,855	0.4	Chinese	77,890	0.4
Yugoslav	104,955	0.5	Serbo-Croatian, etc.	74,190	0.3	Serbo-Croatian, etc.	29,310	0.1
Swedish	101,870	0.5	Swedish	21,680	0.1	Swedish	2,210	0.0

Source: 1971 Census of Population
Bulletin 1.3-2,
Table 2.

Source: 1971 Census of Canada,
Bulletin 1.3-4,
Table 17.

Source: 1971 Census of Canada,
Bulletin 1.3-5,
Table 16.

TABLE A-2 -- MAJOR ETHNIC ORIGIN CATEGORIES - FOREIGN BORN AND NATIVE BORN
CANADA, 1971

ETHNIC GROUP	BORN IN CANADA		FOREIGN-BORN															
	Number	%	TOTAL		Immigrated before 1946				1946-1955		1956-1960		1961-1965		1966-1968		1969-1971	
			Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%		
British Isles	8,434,540	87.6	1,189,580	12.4	508,400	5.2	218,095	2.3	140,220	1.5	98,710	1.0	135,100	1.4	89,055	0.9		
French	6,068,135	98.2	111,990	1.8	38,760	0.6	18,015	0.3	13,295	0.2	13,290	0.2	16,630	0.3	12,010	0.2		
German	993,370	75.4	323,830	24.6	78,705	6.0	120,505	9.1	62,045	4.7	23,810	1.8	23,310	1.8	15,455	1.2		
Italian	334,940	45.8	395,880	54.2	25,685	3.5	106,450	14.6	106,120	14.5	75,330	10.3	62,600	8.6	19,705	2.7		
Ukrainian	474,250	81.7	106,410	18.3	63,455	10.9	33,865	5.8	3,965	0.7	2,370	0.4	1,620	0.3	1,140	0.2		
Netherlands	275,030	64.6	150,920	35.4	13,560	3.2	88,615	20.8	27,185	6.3	7,845	1.8	8,465	2.0	5,240	1.2		
Polish	210,920	66.7	105,510	33.3	33,490	10.6	42,510	13.4	10,860	3.4	9,710	3.1	5,405	1.7	3,530	1.1		
Jewish	186,450	62.8	110,495	37.2	41,325	13.9	27,770	9.4	13,510	4.5	9,580	3.2	10,940	3.7	7,370	2.5		
Scandinavian	300,085	78.0	84,710	22.0	47,505	12.3	12,680	3.3	11,500	3.0	4,040	1.0	4,640	1.2	4,340	1.1		

Sources: 1971 Census of Population,
Bulletin 1.4-10 and
Bulletin 1.4-12.

TABLE A-3 - MAJOR ETHNIC GROUPS BY PROVINCE, CANADA, 1971

Province	British Isles	%	French	%	German	%	Italian	%	Ukrainian	%	Dutch	%	Polish	%	Jewish	%
Newfoundland	489,565	5.1	15,410	0.2	2,375	0.2	495	0.1	175	0.0	665	0.2	280	0.1	360	0.1
Prince Edward Island	92,285	1.0	15,325	0.2	955	0.1	105	0.0	125	0.0	1,245	0.3	110	0.0	60	0.0
Nova Scotia	611,310	6.4	80,215	1.3	40,910	3.1	3,770	0.5	2,315	0.4	14,845	3.5	3,260	1.0	2,535	0.9
New Brunswick	365,735	3.8	235,025	3.8	8,410	0.6	1,380	0.2	600	0.1	5,365	1.3	690	0.2	1,030	0.3
Québec	640,045	6.7	4,759,360	77.0	53,870	4.1	169,655	23.2	20,325	3.5	12,590	3.0	23,970	7.6	115,990	39.1
Ontario	4,576,010	47.5	737,360	11.9	475,320	36.1	463,095	63.4	159,880	27.5	206,940	48.6	144,115	45.5	135,195	45.5
Manitoba	414,125	4.3	86,500	1.4	123,065	9.3	10,445	1.4	114,410	19.7	35,300	8.3	42,705	13.5	20,010	6.7
Saskatchewan	390,190	4.1	56,200	0.9	180,095	13.7	2,865	0.4	85,920	14.8	19,040	4.5	26,910	8.5	2,195	0.7
Alberta	761,665	7.9	94,665	1.5	231,005	17.5	24,805	3.4	135,510	23.3	58,565	13.7	44,325	14.0	7,320	2.5
British Columbia	1,265,455	13.1	96,550	1.6	198,315	15.1	53,795	7.4	60,145	10.4	70,535	16.6	29,545	9.3	12,175	4.1
Yukon	8,945	0.1	1,230	0.0	1,555	0.1	160	0.0	610	0.1	515	0.1	245	0.1	35	0.0
North West Territories	8,785	0.1	2,275	0.0	1,330	0.1	250	0.0	635	0.1	340	0.1	270	0.1	30	0.0
Total	9,624,115	100.0	6,180,120	100.0	1,317,200	100.0	730,820	100.0	580,660	100.0	425,945	100.0	316,425	100.0	296,945	100.0

Source: 1971 Census of Population,
Bulletin 1.3-2,
Table 2.

TABLE A-4 - MAJOR MOTHER TONGUES BY PROVINCE, CANADA, 1971

Province	English	%	French	%	German	%	Italian	%	Ukrainian	%	Dutch	%	Polish	%	Yiddish	%
Newfoundland	514,520	4.0	3,640	0.1	515	0.1	175	0.0	50	0.0	115	0.1	45	0.0	30	0.1
Prince Edward Island	103,105	0.8	7,360	0.1	140	0.0	35	0.0	30	0.0	280	0.2	40	0.0	0	0.0
Nova Scotia	733,555	5.7	39,335	0.7	2,000	0.4	1,495	0.3	440	0.1	1,850	1.3	555	0.4	240	0.5
New Brunswick	410,400	3.2	215,725	3.7	1,110	0.2	755	0.1	110	0.0	670	0.5	155	0.1	125	0.3
Québec	789,185	6.1	4,867,250	84.0	31,025	5.5	135,455	25.2	11,390	3.7	4,660	3.2	15,480	11.5	21,340	42.8
Ontario	5,971,570	46.0	482,045	8.3	184,885	33.0	344,285	64.0	80,230	25.9	77,470	53.5	73,985	54.9	19,760	39.6
Manitoba	662,720	5.1	60,545	1.0	82,715	14.7	7,260	1.3	72,920	23.5	10,385	7.2	15,900	11.8	5,740	11.5
Saskatchewan	685,920	5.3	31,605	0.5	75,885	13.5	2,040	0.4	53,385	17.2	4,695	3.2	7,675	5.7	415	0.8
Alberta	1,236,935	9.7	46,500	0.8	92,805	16.5	15,570	2.9	70,900	22.9	20,670	14.3	13,725	10.2	1,145	2.3
British Columbia	1,807,255	13.9	38,035	0.7	89,020	15.9	31,030	5.8	20,055	6.5	23,955	16.5	7,105	5.3	1,090	2.2
Yukon	15,345	0.1	450	0.0	560	0.1	75	0.0	150	0.0	100	0.1	55	0.0	5	0.0
North West Territories	16,310	0.1	1,165	0.0	425	0.1	175	0.0	205	0.1	80	0.1	60	0.0	0	0.0
Total	12,973,810	100.0	5,793,650	100.0	561,085	100.0	538,360	100.0	309,855	100.0	144,925	100.0	134,780	100.0	49,890	100.0

TABLE A-5 - MAJOR HOME LANGUAGE BY PROVINCE, CANADA, 1971

PROVINCE	English	%	French	%	Italian	%	German	%	Ukrainian	%	Polish	%	Dutch	%	Yiddish	%
Newfoundland	517,210	3.6	2,295	0.0	50	0.0	170	0.1	15	0.0	20	0.0	20	0.1	15	0.1
Prince Edward Island	106,795	0.7	4,405	0.0	0	0.0	30	0.0	0	0.0	35	0.0	120	0.3	5	0.0
Nova Scotia	753,725	5.2	27,220	0.5	750	0.2	510	0.2	210	0.1	205	0.3	435	1.2	140	0.5
New Brunswick	430,720	3.0	199,080	3.6	205	0.0	310	0.1	45	0.0	115	0.1	90	0.2	105	0.4
Québec	887,875	6.1	4,870,105	87.8	108,660	25.6	13,790	6.5	8,240	5.7	9,680	13.6	1,910	5.3	12,300	46.7
Ontario	6,558,060	45.4	352,465	6.4	280,590	66.0	82,885	38.8	45,100	31.2	45,060	63.5	18,680	51.6	10,780	40.9
Manitoba	816,560	5.7	39,600	0.7	5,475	1.3	39,665	18.6	33,950	23.5	6,160	8.7	3,770	10.4	2,080	7.9
Saskatchewan	832,515	5.8	15,930	0.3	870	0.2	18,125	8.5	24,865	17.2	2,195	3.1	1,020	2.8	90	0.3
Alberta	1,477,960	10.2	22,700	0.4	10,225	2.4	29,275	13.7	27,240	18.8	5,095	7.2	5,130	14.2	385	1.5
British Columbia	2,027,120	14.0	11,505	0.2	18,265	4.3	28,335	13.3	5,045	3.5	2,385	3.4	4,960	13.7	440	1.7
Yukon	17,465	0.1	135	0.0	25	0.0	145	0.1	20	0.0	5	0.0	15	0.0	0	0.0
North West Territories	20,225	0.1	590	0.0	120	0.0	120	0.1	25	0.0	15	0.0	10	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	14,446,235	100.0	5,546,025	100.0	425,235	100.0	213,350	100.0	144,760	100.0	70,960	100.0	36,170	100.0	26,330	100.0

**TABLE A-6 - THE RELATION BETWEEN ETHNIC GROUP AND MOTHER TONGUE,
CANADA, 1971:
MOTHER TONGUES ASSOCIATED WITH THE LARGEST ETHNIC GROUPS**

Mother Tongue	ETHNIC GROUP							
	British Isles	French	German	Italian	Ukrainian	Dutch	Polish	Jewish
English	9,402,135	644,715	813,145	183,400	281,665	262,795	164,525	206,950
French	148,630	5,516,915	19,860	27,695	3,270	2,870	4,360	11,215
German	10,345	5,780	472,820	1,935	3,135	18,225	5,365	4,790
Italian	10,675	5,355	1,285	514,800	550	240	470	700
Ukrainian	4,085	490	1,030	195	283,660	155	14,690	235
Dutch	1,910	275	2,355	130	180	137,820	235	455
Polish	2,210	535	1,105	65	2,955	150	121,420	5,460
Yiddish	250	85	60	5	120	5	145	49,175
Other	43,875	5,970	5,535	2,595	5,125	3,840	5,220	17,965
Total	9,624,115	6,180,120	1,317,195	730,820	580,660	425,945	316,430	296,945

**TABLE A-7
PERCENT OF EACH ETHNIC GROUP UNDERSTANDING SELECTED MOTHER TONGUES**

Mother Tongue	British Isles	French	German	Italian	Ukrainian	Dutch	Polish	Jewish
English	97.7	10.4	61.7	25.1	48.5	61.7	52.0	69.7
French	1.5	89.3	1.5	3.8	0.6	0.7	1.4	3.8
German	0.1	0.1	35.9	0.3	0.5	4.3	1.7	1.6
Italian	0.1	0.1	0.1	70.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2
Ukrainian	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	48.9	0.0	4.6	0.1
Dutch	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	32.4	0.1	0.1
Polish	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.5	0.0	38.4	1.8
Yiddish	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.6
Others	0.6	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.9	0.8	1.7	6.1
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: 1971 Census of Population,
Bulletin 1.4-8.

TABLE A-8
THE RELATION BETWEEN ETHNIC GROUP AND OFFICIAL LANGUAGES,
CANADA, 1971:

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES SPOKEN BY THE LARGEST ETHNIC GROUPS

ETHNIC GROUP	English only	French only	Both	Neither	TOTAL
British Isles	9,052,705	58,670	510,995	1,745	9,624,115
French	505,945	3,714,960	1,958,745	475	6,180,120
German	1,237,775	10,140	52,925	16,355	1,317,195
Italian	462,835	43,795	103,060	121,125	730,820
Ukrainian	543,430	1,140	24,745	11,345	580,660
Dutch	403,095	1,125	18,810	2,915	425,945
Polish	283,590	2,265	22,500	8,075	316,430
Jewish	220,770	4,175	69,275	2,725	296,945

Source: 1971 Census of Population,
Bulletin 1.4-8

PERCENT OF EACH ETHNIC GROUP ABLE TO CONVERSE IN THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

ETHNIC GROUP	English only	French only	Both	Neither	TOTAL
British Isles	94.1	0.6	5.3	0.0	100.0
French	8.2	60.1	31.7	0.0	100.0
German	94.0	0.8	4.0	1.2	100.0
Italian	63.3	6.0	14.1	16.6	100.0
Ukrainian	93.6	0.2	4.2	2.0	100.0
Dutch	94.6	0.3	4.4	0.7	100.0
Polish	89.6	0.7	7.1	2.6	100.0
Jewish	74.4	1.4	23.3	0.9	100.0

Source: 1971 Census of Population,
Bulletin 1.4-8

TABLE A-9
THE RELATION BETWEEN ETHNIC GROUP AND LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME
CANADA, 1971:
HOME LANGUAGES ASSOCIATED WITH THE LARGEST ETHNIC GROUPS

HOME LANGUAGE	ETHNIC GROUP							
	British Isles	French	German	Italian	Ukrainian	Dutch	Polish	Jewish
English	9,471,350	898,715	1,110,590	271,580	441,935	381,960	238,165	249,135
French	134,535	5,275,545	18,565	38,750	2,705	2,620	4,430	10,000
German	2,085	1,890	183,285	720	1,020	7,615	1,625	1,025
Italian	3,015	870	215	417,660	55	55	200	345
Ukrainian	1,485	205	500	110	132,535	95	6,995	85
Dutch	400	175	1,025	45	25	32,885	110	135
Polish	1,705	225	470	80	1,125	40	62,840	1,265
Yiddish	335	60	30	25	45	20	135	25,125
Other	9,205	2,435	2,515	1,850	1,215	655	1,930	9,830
Total	9,624,115	6,180,120	1,317,195	730,820	580,660	425,945	316,430	296,945

TABLE A-10
PERCENT OF EACH ETHNIC GROUP SPEAKING SELECTED LANGUAGES MOST FREQUENTLY AT HOME

HOME LANGUAGE	British Isles	French	German	Italian	Ukrainian	Dutch	Polish	Jewish
English	98.5	14.5	84.4	37.2	76.1	89.8	75.3	84.0
French	1.4	85.5	1.4	5.3	0.5	0.6	1.4	3.4
German	0.0	0.0	13.9	0.1	0.2	1.8	0.5	0.3
Italian	0.0	0.0	0.0	57.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
Ukrainian	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.8	0.0	2.2	0.0
Dutch	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0
Polish	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	19.9	0.4
Yiddish	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.5
Other	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.6	3.3
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: 1971 Census of Population,
Bulletin 1.4-8.

INSTABILITY OF DATA ON ETHNIC GROUP AND MOTHER TONGUE

To obtain an impression of the instability of the data on language and ethnic origin, one can estimate the distribution of a given group in the 1971 Census of population, by five-year age-groups, on the basis of the available data on the same group, by five-year age-groups, in the 1961 Census. The method is described in the note on the Austrians and the Ukrainians.

The following two tables apply the method to the six largest ethnic groups and to the corresponding mother tongues. It should be noted that a positive difference may be the result of immigration, or changes (from another group to the one reported in 1971). Similarly, negative differences could be the result of emigration or changes (from the group as indicated in 1961).

Relatively complex patterns may be traced out by composing the corresponding columns in the two tables:

1. The GERMAN ethnic group shows net gains for all age-groups except the youngest one, while the German mother tongue has an oscillating pattern of gains and losses. It is likely that several phenomena are taking place simultaneously: net immigration of persons with German ethnic origin, some redefinition of ethnic origin between 1961 and 1971 (probably from Dutch to German), and some redefinition of mother tongue (from German to English or French).
2. The ITALIAN group is the clearest: net gains in all age-groups, for ethnic group as well as for mother tongue. This probably reflects the heavy immigration of Italians during the decade. For most age-groups, the gains in mother tongue are somewhat smaller than the corresponding gains in ethnic origin, indicating that some slight redefinition of mother tongue (from Italian to English or French) might have taken place.
3. The UKRAINIAN group shows net gains in ethnic origin, which can only be explained by fairly massive redefinitions (probably from Austrian to Ukrainian, possibly also from Polish). The mother tongue data show generally net losses, suggesting that a redefinition of mother tongue (from Ukrainian to English or French) took place at the same time.
4. The DUTCH ethnic group showed substantial losses during the decade, probably involving a redefinition to German. The corresponding net losses to the mother tongue group tend to be considerably less (note that the most likely group to be involved in this shift is formed by the Mennonites in Manitoba, who used to report their mother tongue, correctly, as German, and their ethnic origin, incorrectly, as Dutch. Thus, a "correction" would affect the ethnic origin,

but not the mother tongue). Some redefinition of mother tongue, to English or French, might also be involved.

5. The POLISH ethnic group generally shows net losses, possibly involving shifts to Ukrainian and Jewish. Corresponding losses to the Polish mother tongue groups tend to be smaller, indicating that the shifts in ethnic origin are not necessarily accompanied by shifts in mother tongue. Again, some shift towards English or French mother tongue might be possible.

6. The JEWISH ethnic group shows a pattern comparable to that of the Ukrainians: large net gains in ethnic origin, which cannot be explained on the basis of immigration, while at the same time the mother-tongue groups showed net losses. A large proportion of the observed increase can almost certainly be attributed to an editing procedure by Statistics Canada. In 1971, all persons who reported "Jewish" as their religion were automatically assigned to the Jewish ethnic group. This procedure was not followed in earlier censuses.

TABLE A-11

IMMIGRANT LANGUAGES

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ACTUAL AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES
BY FIVE-YEAR AGE-GROUPS, FOR SIX IMMIGRANT ETHNIC GROUPS
CANADA, 1961-1971

Age in 1961	German	Italian	Ukrainian	Dutch	Polish	Jewish
0-4	- 3,982	+ 9,021	+ 145	- 10,808	- 5,341	+ 8,780
5-9	+ 1,472	+ 10,251	+ 1,633	- 11,159	- 5,106	+ 9,984
10-14	+ 12,213	+ 23,843	+ 2,828	- 10,214	- 4,374	+ 10,640
15-19	+ 21,919	+ 26,330	+ 4,369	- 4,803	- 686	+ 9,061
20-24	+ 14,991	+ 21,783	+ 3,695	- 2,979	+ 364	+ 6,052
25-29	+ 5,934	+ 14,943	+ 2,936	- 3,077	- 78	+ 6,293
30-34	+ 4,935	+ 7,841	+ 4,351	- 4,507	- 1,909	+ 6,803
35-39	+ 5,841	+ 4,937	+ 5,372	- 3,811	- 2,798	+ 7,863
40-44	+ 3,773	+ 2,872	+ 3,865	- 5,187	- 2,652	+ 7,175
45-49	+ 5,206	+ 4,727	+ 3,291	- 4,510	- 2,844	+ 6,779
50-54	+ 5,175	+ 3,068	+ 4,608	- 3,545	- 3,318	+ 6,515
55-59	+ 5,134	+ 2,614	+ 5,237	- 6,045	- 1,236	+ 5,848
60-64	+ 2,821	+ 1,651	+ 2,775	- 2,283	- 1,184	+ 3,748
65-69	+ 1,568	+ 795	+ 1,891	- 1,473	- 625	+ 2,601
70-74	+ 945	+ 339	+ 745	- 944	- 184	+ 899
75-79	+ 466	+ 329	+ 499	- 469	+ 58	+ 522
80-84	+ 317	+ 60	+ 114	- 93	+ 85	+ 136
85+	+ 117	+ 43	+ 96	+ 11	+ 12	+ 77

TABLE A-12

IMMIGRANT LANGUAGES

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ACTUAL AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES
BY FIVE-YEAR AGE-GROUPS, FOR SIX IMMIGRANT LANGUAGES,
CANADA, 1961-1971

Age in 1961	German	Italian	Ukrainian	Netherlands	Polish	Yiddish
0-4	- 6,806	+ 1,139	- 3,711	- 7,015	- 1,510	- 4,502
5-9	- 981	+ 10,532	- 566	- 5,586	+ 240	- 112
10-14	+ 820	+ 22,810	- 5,089	- 2,700	- 420	- 1,288
15-19	+ 7,868	+ 24,490	- 5,552	+ 298	+ 28	- 807
20-24	+ 4,375	+ 20,153	- 4,204	- 551	- 108	- 1,090
25-29	- 3,567	+ 12,926	- 4,797	- 1,105	- 535	- 838
30-34	- 5,206	+ 6,300	- 3,931	- 1,755	- 1,919	- 1,384
35-39	- 3,162	+ 3,054	- 3,431	- 1,362	- 2,406	- 1,993
40-44	- 2,610	+ 2,216	- 3,322	- 1,231	- 1,555	- 1,996
45-49	- 597	+ 3,863	- 2,053	- 1,036	- 2,063	- 2,580
50-54	+ 563	+ 2,808	+ 424	- 327	- 2,430	- 2,077
55-59	+ 1,480	+ 2,377	+ 1,824	- 233	- 1,136	- 655
60-64	+ 438	+ 1,483	+ 85	- 252	- 1,019	- 1,055
65-69	+ 156	+ 646	- 423	- 127	- 900	- 269
70-74	+ 5	+ 321	- 560	- 12	- 489	- 606
75-79	+ 105	+ 297	- 53	- 85	- 101	- 133
80-84	+ 129	+ 69	- 41	+ 11	+ 3	- 35
85+	+ 45	+ 46	- 52	+ 5	+ 2	+ 32

SOURCES OF ERROR IN THE CENSUS DATA ON LANGUAGE

Since the Census is, to a large extent, no more than a very large survey, the causes of error in Census data are the same kinds which one encounters in all surveys. One can classify the sources of error as follows:

a) ERRORS OF COVERAGE

This is essentially the only type of error which is unique to the Census: ideally, one wishes to enumerate all the members of the population once, and only once. Thus, there are two kinds of errors of coverage: underenumeration (failure to enumerate persons who do belong to the population) and overenumeration (either enumerating persons who do not belong to the population, such as foreign diplomats or temporary visitors from abroad, or enumerating members of the population more than once). The latter kind tends to be very small while the former kind is probably in the order of about 2 percent. No official statement is available at this time about the estimated degree of underenumeration, not about probable variations between subgroups in the degree of underenumeration.

b) NON-RESPONSE ERROR

In these cases, the respondent was enumerated, but failed to answer some of the Census questions. Statistics Canada uses other information for the respondent to impute missing responses. No information is available at this time about the percentage of non-response to the Census questions on language and ethnic origin.

c) RESPONSE ERROR

In these cases, the respondent did answer the question, but gave an incorrect answer. Such errors might be caused by ignorance, misunderstanding of the questions, accidental errors in checking a response category, etcetera.

d) CODING ERRORS

Generally, these are errors introduced during the manual operations which the Census schedules had to undergo. For example, the question on Mother Tongue provided specific answers for English, French, German and Italian. In those cases, the respondent only needed to circle the right answer. For any other category, the name of the language had to be written in, and coders had to introduce a numerical code to replace the verbal response. Any one of such operations is obviously exposed to the risk of errors.

e) PROCESSING ERRORS

These are errors introduced at various stages of the mechanical processing of the data. For example, Census operations will include a consistency check on various questions, and any inconsistent answers found by such procedures are frequently resolved by imputation of a "correct" response. Although it is likely that such procedures do indeed improve the quality of the data, it is conceivable that some new errors are introduced in the process.

f) TABULATION ERRORS

These are introduced when the machine readable material is prepared for printing.

g) SAMPLING ERRORS

Although the Census itself aims at reaching all members of the population, most of the questions were asked only of a 1/3 sample: the "Long Form", received by 33 1/3% of all private households, and by all collective households (and by all households in remote areas) contains the questions on Ethnic Group Membership, Home Language and Official Languages. The "Short Form", received by all households (i.e. 2/3 of the households received the Short Form, 1/3 received the Long Form, the first part of which is identical to the Short Form) contains the question of Mother Tongue.

Although individual weights have been calculated (to estimate how many persons are represented by an individual who received the Long Form), there is obviously some variability on the sampling. Thus, all tabulations involving at least one question from the Long Form are affected by such sampling variation.

In some of the following notes we will give some examples of the manifestations of the errors mentioned above.

MEASURES OF RELIABILITY

One way to express the reliability of the reported data is by means of the square root of the "mean square error", also written as the "root mean square error" or RMSE. Such a measure is essentially equivalent to the more traditional "standard error of estimate", and is designed to include the effects introduced by response errors, coding errors, processing errors and sampling errors. It does not include the effects of tabulation errors, and certainly does not include the effects of systematic errors (bias) in the data. For example, if there were a systematic understatement of Lithuanian ethnic group membership, the RMSE would not incorporate this fact in the reliability measures of the reported frequency of Lithuanian ethnic origin.

The RMSE varies for the different questions on language. Moreover, the exact value of the RMSE is a function of the reported frequency. For a given reported frequency, one can be 95 percent certain (Census reports refer to "reasonably certain") that the true frequency lies within plus or minus twice the RMSE, and 99 percent certain ("virtually certain") that the true frequency lies within plus or minus three times the RMSE. E.g. of the reported frequency on Mother Tongue English for a given area were 100, we could be 95% certain that the true value fell between 81 and 119, and 99% certain that it fell between 72 and 128.

Table A-13 gives the values of RMSE for selected frequencies for the 1971 Census questions related to language.

A NOTE OF CAUTION

Many of the demographic analyses of language characteristics are using ratios between reported frequencies. For example, an estimate of "language maintenance" is frequently obtained by dividing the number of persons speaking a particular mother tongue, by the number of persons belonging to the corresponding ethnic origin. As the table of root mean square errors indicates, the amount of uncertainty associated with both the numerator and the denominator of such ratios may be considerable. For small frequencies, the reliability of the ratio is generally even less than that of the two figures producing the ratio. Thus, ratios in which the numerator is less than 100 would tend to be quite unreliable.

TABLE A-13
VALUES OF THE ROOT MEAN SQUARE ERROR FOR SELECTED FREQUENCIES,
1971 CENSUS DATA ON LANGUAGE AND ETHNIC ORIGIN

CENSUS ESTIMATE	50	100	500	1,000	5,000	10,000	50,000	100,000
MOTHER TONGUE								
100% data	6.9	9.4	26.5	35.2	69.8	109	207	311
Sample data:								
English, French	14.6	20.5	45.3	63.7	143	203	457	641
All other languages	19.8	27.8	63.1	88.6	196	280	614	869
HOME LANGUAGE								
English, French	13.9	19.7	43.5	61.7	136	191	428	626
All other languages	21.4	30.1	67.5	95.6	207	308	668	951
OFFICIAL LANGUAGES								
English	12.8	17.9	39.3	56.1	126	177	397	558
French, Both or	15.2	21.6	49.3	69.3	150	216	498	684
Neither								

Source: BRACKSTONE, G.J., "The Reliability of 1971 Census Language Data", unpublished paper, Ottawa, October 1974.

THE EXTENT OF SAMPLING ERRORS: AN EXAMPLE

Aside from the use of root mean square errors, to assess the reliability of the 1971 Census data on language, there are some instances where it is possible to evaluate the extent of sampling errors separately. One such case involves the data on Mother Tongue. As was already indicated before, Mother Tongue is the only one among the variables on language in the 1971 Census which was asked of all respondents. In various crosstabulations of Mother Tongue with other characteristics, such as Ethnic Origin, the data were taken from the Long Form, that is from the 33 1/3% sample. Thus, for 20 language-groups we can make a comparison between the marginal frequency obtained from the total population, and the estimated marginal frequency obtained from the sample. The difference between the two values is almost completely due to sampling errors. Table provides the data.

The sign of the values in the column labelled "Difference" indicates whether the true values are greater than (+) or less than, the values based on estimates.

Such sampling variations can occasionally give rise to even greater anomalies than the ones indicated in the table. When one repeats the comparison at the level of the provinces, there are several cases where the marginal frequency for the total mother tongue group based on the Short Form (=100%) is less than the number of persons with that mother tongue and belonging to the corresponding ethnic group, as reported from the Long Form. Included in this group are, among others: the Dutch in Prince Edward Island, the Poles in New Brunswick, and the Jews in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia.

TABLE A-14
COMPARISON OF MARGINAL FREQUENCIES OF SELECTED LANGUAGE-GROUPS:
Mother tongue (100% sample) with Mother tongue
(as estimated from 33 1/3% sample),
Canada, 1971

Language	Frequency (100% sample)	Frequency (33 1/3% sample)	Difference
English	12,973,810	12,967,440	+ 6,370
French	5,793,650	5,792,710	+ 940
Chinese	94,855	95,910	- 55
Croatian, etc.	74,190	75,625	- 1,435
Czech & Slovak	45,150	45,870	- 720
Finnish	36,725	36,375	+ 350
Geelic & Welsh	24,360	24,605	- 245
German	561,085	558,965	+ 2,120
Greek	104,455	103,725	+ 730
Indian & Eskimo	179,820	178,540	+ 1,280
Italian	538,360	538,765	- 405
Japanese	16,890	17,050	- 160
Hungarian	86,835	87,470	- 635
Dutch	144,925	146,690	- 1,765
Polish	134,780	136,540	- 1,760
Portuguese	86,925	85,845	+ 1,080
Russian	31,735	31,955	- 210
Scandinavian	84,340	84,835	- 495
Ukrainian	309,855	309,890	- 35
Yiddish	49,890	50,320	- 430

QUESTIONABLE EDITING PROCEDURES

Mention has already been made (page 12) of the consequences of editing procedures for the size of the Jewish ethnic group. Other editing procedures carried out in the processing of the responses to the Census questionnaires involved the various questions on language. If the respondent's Mother Tongue were French, and his Home Language were English, he was automatically coded as "Both" with regards to the Official Language. The same occurred to respondents with English mother tongue and French home language. Although it is not likely that respondents "forget" their mother tongue, it is still a possibility, especially in those areas where the particular language is losing ground to the other official language.

Estimates were made of the number of persons whose responses were thus changed by machine editing procedures.

The following figures indicate the degree to which the responses to the question on Official Languages were affected:

English only	reported as	14,469,540	underreported by	97,000
French only	reported as	3,879,225	underreported by	32,000
Both	reported as	2,900,155	overreported by	129,000
Neither	reported as	319,360	not affected	

These figures may be used to estimate the degree to which a language group loses through "forgetting". For example, there are 97,000 persons who reported their official language as "English only", with mother tongue French. In other words, 97,000 persons of French mother tongue (or 1.7%) claim to be unable to converse in French.

THE SUBJECTIVE NATURE OF THE DATA ON ETHNIC ORIGIN

One of the consequences of the change in method of data collection between 1961 and 1971 (initially, Census by enumerator; in 1971, Census responses usually given by respondents) is that the degree to which systematic errors occurred has changed. One such instance involves the categories "Austrian" and "Ukrainian" with regards to the question on Ethnic Origin. It has been documented that in earlier Censuses (1921, 1931, 1941, 1951) some confusion appears to have occurred, due to the fact that the area now known as the Ukraine used to belong to the former Austro-Hungarian empire.

An analysis of the data by ethnic origin, by age-groups, for 1961 and 1971 suggests that the 1961 data suffered from this problem, while the 1971 seems to give a more accurate picture. The analysis proceeds as follows:

1. We begin with the data in the 1961 Census, by ethnic group, by five-year age-group.
2. Assuming that no migration occurs (or that immigration and emigration cancel out), we can estimate the number of persons of each five-year age-group which can be expected to survive the intercensal decade. To do this, we calculate "survival ratios", using a mortality table or "life table".
3. We now compare the expected distribution of the ethnic group, by five-year age-group, with the actual distribution, in the later Census.
4. The differences between the two distributions are either the result of net migration, or deviations from the assumptions about mortality, or changes in the ethnic origin of respondents.

The following table shows the differences between the actual frequencies in 1971 and the expected frequencies in 1971, based on the estimated survivorship ratios, for the Austrian and Ukrainian ethnic groups. It is very obvious that the Austrian ethnic group declined much faster between 1961 and 1971 than one would expect on the basis of mortality and emigration, while the Ukrainian group increased, despite mortality and the virtual absence of immigration. It is likely that such systematic differences were indeed produced by a "redefinition" of ethnic origin: from Austrian in 1961, to Ukrainian in 1971.

TABLE A-15
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ACTUAL AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES,
BY FIVE-YEAR AGE-GROUPS, FOR AUSTRIAN AND UKRAINIAN ETHNIC ORIGINS,
CANADA, 1961-1971.

Age in 1961	Austrians	Ukrainians
0-4	- 6287	+ 145
5-9	- 6374	+ 1633
10-14	- 5718	+ 2828
15-19	- 4076	+ 4369
20-24	- 2603	+ 3695
25-29	- 3370	+ 2936
30-34	- 4846	+ 4351
35-39	- 5006	+ 5372
40-44	- 4455	+ 3865
45-49	- 3909	+ 3291
50-54	- 3514	+ 4608
55-59	- 3421	+ 5237
60-64	- 3048	+ 2775
65-69	- 2361	+ 1891
70-74	- 1381	+ 745
75-79	- 425	+ 499
80-84	- 79	+ 114
85+	- 3	+ 96

THE CASES OF INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION

In the analysis of Census data on language, it is frequently assumed that members of a particular ethnic group would normally have one of three languages as their mother tongue: English, French, or the language associated with that ethnic origin. For example, it is assumed that persons of Italian ethnic origin have English, French or Italian as their mother tongue. It is furthermore assumed that no one of a certain ethnic group has a different "immigrant" language as mother tongue. That is, one normally assumes that all persons learning Italian as mother tongue will be of Italian ethnic origin. Similar assumptions are usually made about the relation between Home Language and Ethnic Origin.

Thus, for the analysis of the "immigrant" languages, one assumes a one-to-one relationship between the ethnic group and the corresponding language, e.g. Polish ethnic origin and Polish mother tongue, etcetera. For the Jewish ethnic group, one usually assumes Yiddish to be the corresponding language.

We know, however, that for several of the groups this assumption is not fully supported by the facts. For example, there are many persons with German Mother Tongue, whose ethnic origin is not German, but Austrian, Polish, Swiss, Jewish, or even Dutch (the latter case is interesting in itself, since most of those persons are not truly Dutch in ethnic origin - they tend to be German in ethnic origin, but report themselves, incorrectly, as Dutch. Most of these cases are found in the Kitchener-Waterloo area in Southern Ontario, and in Census divisions 1 and 2 in Manitoba).

A cross-tabulation of Ethnic Origin with Mother Tongue enables us to assess the degree to which the facts differ from the assumptions. Two measures can be devised:

1. INCLUSION

Is the number of persons from other ethnic groups associated with a particular mother tongue;

2. EXCLUSION

is the number of persons in a particular ethnic group whose mother tongue is neither English or French, nor the language associated with that ethnic group.

Thus, following the case of the persons of Dutch ethnic origin with German mother tongue, we would expect the Dutch ethnic group to have a high value for exclusion, the German group to have a high value for inclusion.

The following table gives the estimated values for INCLUSION and EXCLUSION for the seven largest "immigrant" languages.

TABLE A-16
ANALYSIS OF INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION, SELECTED ETHNIC GROUPS, CANADA, 1971

ETHNIC GROUP	MOTHER TONGUE			HOME LANGUAGE		
	Inclusion	Exclusion		Inclusion	Exclusion	
		Born in Canada	Born outside Canada		Born in Canada	Born outside Canada
German	86,145	5,370	5,990	30,070	1,635	3,125
Italian	23,965	1,495	3,425	7,575	890	1,940
Ukrainian	26,230	6,250	5,820	12,220	1,060	2,415
Netherlands	8,875	15,755	6,715	3,285	6,250	2,230
Polish	15,115	16,270	9,845	8,120	4,300	6,695
Jewish	1,145	2,950	26,655	1,205	1,305	11,385
Scandinavian	7,840	3,315	2,805	1,880	960	1,230

Source: 1971 Census of Canada,
Bulletin 1.4-8

THE MEASUREMENT OF LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE FOR "IMMIGRANT LANGUAGES"

With the available questions on language and ethnic origin in the 1971 Census of population, it is possible to estimate the degree to which members of various immigrant language groups maintain an association with their original language. If we assume that members of a particular ethnic group, when they arrived in Canada, spoke the language of that ethnic group, and that in following generations their descendants either maintained that language, or shifted to one of the official languages, then we can set up the following measures:

1. The ratio between the number of persons with a given mother tongue and the number of persons belonging to the corresponding ethnic group can be taken as a measure of "mother tongue retention".
2. The ratio between the number of persons speaking a given language most often at home and the number of persons associated with the corresponding mother tongue can be taken as a measure of "home language retention".

There are, of course, problems with these measures. First of all, the notes on inclusion and exclusion indicate that the assumption of a one-to-one relation between home language, mother tongue and ethnic group is not completely justifiable. Especially for the Dutch, German and Jewish groups there are significant deviations from that assumption. Secondly, as the case of the Austrian-Ukrainian confusion indicates, data for some ethnic groups are very unreliable. Ratios, such as the ones outlined above, are obviously susceptible to distortions in the numerator and the denominator. When the biases affecting the data operate in different fashion on the two components of these ratios, the resulting values are even less reliable than the numerator and denominator were to begin with. Thirdly, the former ratio (estimating "mother tongue retention") is hardly a good measure of current language characteristics. Note that the basis for this measure is all persons belonging to a given ethnic group, regardless of the time when the paternal ancestors of the group first settled in Canada. Thus, for the Ukrainians we are dealing with an ethnic group in which 82% is Canadian-born and in which another 11% arrived in this country before 1946. The Italians, on the other hand, had only 46% born in Canada and only 3.5% arrived before 1946. Note, furthermore, that the numerator for this measure is formed by the number of persons who first learned a particular language in their childhood (and who still understand it). Aside from the problems of persons "forgetting" their mother tongue, it is obvious that these mother tongue data at best refer to language characteristics at some point in the past, that is when the respondents were indeed in their childhood. Thus, for someone seventy years old,

these data refer to characteristics some sixty-five to seventy years ago! Thus, we can take the "mother tongue retention ratio" at best as a measure of the degree of language maintenance in the ethnic group up to, and including, the respondent's childhood. We might call this "ancestral language maintenance".

In a similar view, we could take the latter measure and argue that it measures the degree of language maintenance during the respondent's lifetime, since it measures the language characteristics of the respondent's childhood and, with some limitations the language characteristics of his present home.

These measures can be calculated for a great variety of groups, subdivided by age in many cases. Moreover, these ratios can frequently be calculated for provinces, metropolitan areas, countries, etcetera. Following this note is a variety of tables summarizing the language maintenance of the largest immigrant groups.

TABLE A-17
IMMIGRANT LANGUAGES
INDICES OF LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE, SIX LARGEST (IMMIGRANT) ETHNIC GROUPS,
Canada and Provinces, 1971

CANADA	German		Italian		Ukrainian		Dutch		Polish		Jewish	
Provinces	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Canada	.38	.41	.79	.74	.47	.53	.25	.34	.53	.43	.53	.17
Newfoundland	.33	.22	.29	.35	.30	.29	.17	.17	.44	.16	.50	.08
Prince Edward Island	.21	.15	.00	.33	.00	.24	.43	.22	.88	.36	—	—
Nova Scotia	.26	.05	.50	.40	.48	.19	.24	.12	.37	.17	.58	.10
New Brunswick	.28	.13	.27	.55	.41	.18	.13	.12	.74	.22	.84	.12
Québec	.44	.58	.80	.80	.72	.56	.41	.37	.62	.65	.58	.18
Ontario	.45	.39	.82	.74	.56	.50	.24	.37	.61	.51	.55	.15
Manitoba	.48	.66	.75	.70	.47	.64	.36	.29	.39	.37	.36	.29
Saskatchewan	.24	.42	.43	.71	.47	.62	.22	.25	.29	.28	.22	.19
Alberta	.32	.40	.66	.63	.38	.52	.25	.35	.37	.31	.34	.16
British Columbia	.32	.43	.59	.58	.25	.33	.21	.34	.46	.24	.40	.09
Yukon	.26	.36	.33	.47	.13	.25	.15	.19	.09	.22	—	—
North West Territories	.28	.32	.69	.70	.12	.32	.12	.24	.25	.22	—	—

N.B.: A measures "home language retention" and is calculated as the ratio between the speakers of a given home language and the number of people associated with that mother tongue.

B measures "mother tongue retention"; it is the ratio between the number of persons associated with a given mother tongue and the number of persons belonging to the corresponding ethnic group.

— indicates that the measures was not calculated because the base was represented by a frequency of fewer than 100 persons.

THE USE OF COHORTS IN THE ANALYSIS OF LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE

One way to help the researcher to make inferences about trends in language maintenance among the speakers of various immigrant languages is by means of cohort analysis. For the sake of this analysis, we divide the group under analysis into birth cohorts; a birth cohort is formed by all persons who were born in a given year or group of years. If one uses five-year periods for this analysis, it will be obvious that the same birth cohorts will reappear in all the censuses under consideration. That is, the cohort containing all persons born between 1927 and 1931 shows up in the Census of 1931 (where these persons were 0-4 years old), of 1941 (where they were 10-14 years old) and so on. In the following group of tables, all five-year birth cohorts from 1877 through 1971 are used to document trends in mother tongue retention.

Note that the size of a particular cohort changes over time through deaths, emigration, immigration and "redefinition" of category. That is, shifts away from, for example, German ethnic origin (as occurred from 1931 to 1941) are reflected in decreasing cohort sizes.

The tables are laid out in such a fashion that a horizontal line gives the information, over time, for a particular birth cohort (the birth year for the cohort are indicated in the left-hand column of the table). Reading diagonally up, one finds a comparison between age-groups: the top entry in each of the five columns always refers to the group which was between 0 and 4 years of age in that particular census.

Changes in values for the mother tongue retention ratio for a given cohort, from one census to the next, do not have unique interpretations. The following phenomena may have occurred:

1. INCREASES in mother tongue retention ratios, from one census to the next, may have been caused by:
 - a) Sizeable net immigration in the intercensal period. Generally, recent immigrants have a mother tongue which coincides with the ethnic origin.
 - b) Decreases in the size of the ethnic origin category (through redefinition), without accompanying redefinitions in mother tongue (note that a ratio increases when we decrease its denominator).
 - c) Increases in the size of the mother tongue category (through redefinition), without accompanying redefinitions in mother tongue.
 - d) Some combination of the causes specified above.

2. DECREASES in mother tongue retention ratios, from one census to the next, may have been caused by:

- a) Increases in the size of the ethnic origin category (through redefinition), without accompanying redefinitions in mother tongue.
- b) Decreases in the size of the mother tongue category, without an accompanying change in ethnic origin.
- c) Some combination of the causes specified above.

To complicate life even further, increases might result as the net effect of one of the factors sub 1 above, and a weaker factor sub 2 above.

To some degree, we can sort out which of the causes may have operated by analyzing absolute frequencies. For example, if the cause of change were primarily immigration, supporting evidence should be available in the more recent census (in the form of the data on the foreign-born, tabulated by ethnic origin and year of arrival), and in the data on immigration (which until 1967 were tabulated by the ethnic origin of the immigrants). If a redefinition of either mother tongue or ethnic origin (or both) occurred, we should find, first of all, that the changes in absolute frequencies, from one census to the next, can not be explained through immigration, mortality and the like. Moreover, we should be able to locate the receiving group (for a redefinition "away" from the original category), or the sending group (for a redefinition "toward" the category being analyzed). For example, if we postulate that a shift from Austrians ethnic origin towards Ukrainian ethnic origin took place from 1961 to 1971, we should find large increases in the size of the Ukrainian ethnic origin cohorts, and parallel decreases in the size of the Austrian ethnic origin cohorts.

A quick glance at the tables will show the cases where the factors mentioned above were probably operating: immigration has affected the data for Italians from 1951 to 1961, and from 1961 to 1971, as well as the Dutch from 1951 to 1961. A redefinition "away" from the original ethnic origin affects the Ukrainian data from 1951 to 1961 (especially the cohorts born before 1927), and the Jewish data from 1951 to 1961 (cohorts born before 1917). Similarly, a redefinition "toward" the ethnic origin category appears to affect the Jewish data for 1961 to 1971, the German data for 1961-1971 and the Ukrainian data for 1961-1971.

Further indications for the understatement of ethnic origin can be found in those cases where the number of persons associated with a particular mother tongue exceeds the corresponding number of persons in the ethnic group. For these cases, of course, the mother tongue maintenance ratio assumes values of over 100%. The most obvious

cases of this are found for the Ukrainians (all of 1931, almost all of 1941, and all cohorts born before 1912 for 1951 and 1961) and some of the older cohorts in the Jewish ethnic group in 1961. Finally, virtually all of the data suggest that a constant process of mother tongue "attrition" is operating on all ethnic groups: whenever immigration is light or non-existent, and whenever redefinitions in ethnic origin appear to be absent, we find declining mother tongue retention ratios. It is likely that this pattern reflects a gradual shift of persons to indicate English or French as their mother tongue.

TABLE A-18
INDICES OF INDIVIDUAL HOME LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE
FOR SIX LANGUAGE GROUPS, BY FIVE-YEAR AGE-GROUPS,
CANADA, 1971

AGE	German	Italian	Ukrainian	Netherlands	Polish	Yiddish
0-4	.76	.96	.53	.69	.84	.87
5-9	.55	.83	.44	.39	.61	.60
10-14	.43	.76	.46	.29	.52	.58
15-19	.37	.72	.43	.22	.54	.55
20-24	.31	.74	.36	.15	.49	.57
25-29	.32	.75	.25	.15	.42	.49
30-34	.32	.79	.22	.16	.42	.56
35-39	.30	.80	.22	.15	.39	.48
40-44	.32	.80	.29	.17	.44	.45
45-49	.33	.79	.45	.20	.50	.46
50-54	.33	.75	.39	.28	.48	.50
55-59	.35	.75	.47	.39	.49	.41
60-64	.40	.75	.64	.50	.52	.46
65-69	.43	.73	.81	.55	.62	.52
70-74	.48	.71	.86	.53	.69	.59
75-79	.49	.65	.88	.54	.66	.65
80-84	.49	.66	.93	.40	.65	.65
85-89	.52	.61	.89	.38	.72	.68
90-94	.51	.52	.92	.29	.75	.68
95+	.47	.71	.96	.00	.83	.69

TABLE A-19
INDICES OF MOTHER TONGUE RETENTION
FOR SIX ETHNIC GROUPS, BY FIVE-YEAR AGE-GROUPS,
CANADA, 1971

AGE	German	Italian	Ukrainian	Dutch	Polish	Jewish
0-4	.21	.64	.19	.08	.16	.05
5-9	.20	.59	.21	.08	.17	.05
10-14	.23	.59	.27	.11	.19	.06
15-19	.27	.66	.33	.19	.26	.08
20-24	.30	.76	.34	.40	.32	.09
25-29	.38	.78	.41	.52	.29	.08
30-34	.51	.85	.53	.56	.34	.08
35-39	.58	.85	.63	.61	.42	.11
40-44	.63	.84	.69	.61	.56	.13
45-49	.62	.81	.76	.58	.68	.18
50-54	.57	.78	.77	.54	.67	.23
55-59	.60	.81	.83	.52	.69	.29
60-64	.68	.87	.89	.54	.75	.35
65-69	.73	.89	.95	.54	.78	.42
70-74	.73	.91	.95	.45	.81	.46
75-79	.68	.90	.94	.36	.76	.50
80-84	.64	.93	.95	.33	.73	.55
85-89	.64	.93	.90	.23	.70	.53
90-94	.61	.98	.79	.29	.61	.54
95+	.52	1.00	.77	.20	.67	.59

TABLE A-20
MOTHER-TONGUE RETENTION RATIOS FOR COHORTS,
CANADA, 1931-1971

GERMAN ETHNIC ORIGIN					
BIRTH YEARS	1931	1941	1951	1961	1971
1967-1971					20.7
1962-1966					20.1
1957-1961				27.3	23.0
1952-1956				28.3	27.1
1947-1951			23.8	32.7	29.6
1942-1946			31.1	39.6	38.4
1937-1941		58.4	40.6	54.7	50.6
1932-1936		63.5	49.7	66.3	58.3
1927-1931	75.0	66.8	55.1	72.5	62.9
1922-1926	74.8	68.3	57.7	71.8	62.3
1917-1921	73.3	66.1	56.3	65.3	57.0
1912-1916	75.0	67.3	60.0	67.7	60.3
1907-1911	79.3	74.1	68.8	75.2	68.2
1902-1906	84.0	78.7	74.9	80.2	73.1
1897-1901	83.9	78.2	75.2	80.0	73.0
1892-1896	80.2	75.7	72.3	74.0	68.2
1887-1891	77.5	74.6	70.3	70.4	63.9
1882-1886	75.9	73.5	69.6	69.2	64.5
1877-1881	73.9	72.6	67.6	66.1	60.7

ITALIAN ETHNIC ORIGIN					
BIRTH YEARS	1931	1941	1951	1961	1971
1967-1971					64.1
1962-1966					58.7
1957-1961				64.9	58.7
1952-1956				58.1	65.9
1947-1951			25.7	63.9	76.1
1942-1946			28.2	63.6	78.5
1937-1941		45.7	39.2	80.0	84.7
1932-1936		51.8	50.0	84.6	85.0
1927-1931	75.4	58.0	59.1	84.3	83.8
1922-1926	77.9	63.2	64.2	83.3	81.0
1917-1921	80.6	65.7	63.7	78.1	78.0
1912-1916	85.7	70.5	70.6	81.1	81.2
1907-1911	88.5	77.6	77.5	86.3	87.2
1902-1906	77.1	86.5	84.3	87.3	89.2
1897-1907	95.2	90.9	89.0	90.8	90.6
1892-1896	96.5	92.0	89.8	91.7	90.1
1887-1891	97.1	94.2	92.0	93.1	93.3
1882-1886	97.2	95.0	92.9	93.9	92.9
1877-1881	96.2	94.0	92.9	92.8	98.0

UKRAINIAN ETHNIC ORIGIN					
BIRTH YEARS	1931	1941	1951	1961	1971
1967-1971					19.5
1962-1966					21.7
1957-1961				33.4	26.6
1952-1956				35.4	33.2
1947-1951			55.6	48.5	34.4
1942-1946			67.0	62.8	40.8
1937-1941		96.8	80.4	73.9	52.7
1932-1936		100.4	89.0	84.0	63.0
1927-1931	110.4	101.3	89.6	89.6	68.8
1922-1926	111.0	102.2	92.3	94.7	76.0
1917-1921	111.2	100.5	92.5	96.0	76.8
1912-1916	111.5	101.0	96.8	99.9	83.0
1907-1911	111.3	103.4	102.7	106.9	88.8
1902-1906	113.1	105.0	107.1	111.0	94.6
1897-1901	113.5	105.7	108.5	117.0	95.4
1892-1896	115.7	106.6	108.0	121.5	94.3
1887-1891	115.2	107.2	108.7	121.7	94.6
1882-1886	115.6	107.0	108.3	120.9	90.5
1877-1881	114.3	106.0	108.7	115.4	78.7

DUTCH ETHNIC ORIGIN

BIRTH YEARS	1931	1941	1951	1961	1971
1967-1971					8.0
1962-1966					8.3
1957-1961				19.8	10.9
1952-1956				25.3	19.0
1947-1951			27.7	36.7	39.9
1942-1946			32.4	43.2	51.5
1937-1941		24.4	33.7	52.4	56.4
1932-1936		25.5	36.1	58.4	60.9
1927-1931	18.9	26.2	38.0	57.9	60.9
1922-1926	18.3	26.3	40.1	54.8	57.7
1917-1921	17.2	25.2	36.0	46.9	53.4
1912-1916	17.1	24.8	23.5	44.9	51.6
1907-1911	20.0	26.0	35.2	43.6	53.9
1902-1906	25.2	30.0	38.7	42.8	53.5
1897-1901	23.6	28.0	33.6	34.8	44.7
1892-1896	19.9	26.3	29.5	27.8	36.2
1887-1891	19.2	25.2	26.6	22.6	33.5
1882-1886	17.8	23.3	25.0	21.4	23.3
1877-1881	15.3	20.4	20.8	18.9	28.8

POLISH ETHNIC ORIGIN

BIRTH YEARS	1931	1941	1951	1961	1971
1967-1971					16.3
1962-1966					16.6
1957-1961				20.3	18.9
1952-1956				21.6	25.9
1947-1951			30.7	28.4	31.5
1942-1946			30.7	27.8	28.9
1937-1941		59.5	38.1	35.4	34.0
1932-1936		64.9	47.9	44.6	41.8
1927-1931	74.2	69.7	55.6	60.0	56.3
1922-1926	75.6	72.2	65.5	69.7	68.0
1917-1921	75.4	69.9	64.6	65.8	66.7
1912-1916	76.8	73.2	68.4	69.2	68.7
1907-1911	80.5	81.0	71.4	74.4	74.7
1902-1906	86.5	87.8	77.8	79.1	77.8
1897-1901	88.7	90.5	79.8	81.2	80.5
1892-1896	88.4	91.2	79.6	83.9	75.5
1887-1891	89.0	92.2	81.7	86.1	72.7
1882-1886	87.5	91.2	81.0	84.6	69.8
1877-1881	88.1	90.5	78.1	84.4	61.0

JEWISH ETHNIC ORIGIN

BIRTH YEARS	1931	1941	1951	1961	1971
1967-1971					4.9
1962-1966					4.8
1957-1961				39.3	5.5
1952-1956				13.0	7.7
1947-1951			27.0	21.7	9.1
1942-1946			28.2	19.8	7.6
1937-1941		64.3	38.2	26.4	8.2
1932-1936		65.5	45.6	28.5	10.6
1927-1931	93.0	69.2	49.6	36.0	13.2
1922-1926	94.3	73.8	52.0	45.5	18.0
1917-1921	94.9	74.1	52.9	51.7	22.8
1912-1916	95.8	77.0	61.0	63.0	28.6
1907-1911	96.2	76.9	68.9	72.7	35.1
1902-1906	95.8	77.4	74.6	83.2	41.7
1897-1901	95.9	78.2	78.9	95.5	45.6
1892-1896	95.8	81.4	84.6	97.1	49.8
1887-1891	95.5	83.3	87.8	100.7	54.8
1882-1886	95.5	85.6	91.5	105.5	52.7
1877-1881	95.7	86.4	94.8	107.9	54.4

DESCRIBING PATTERNS OF RESIDENTIAL DISTRIBUTION: INDICES OF SEGREGATION

When we compare the distributions of language groups, or ethnic groups, it is obvious that they are not distributed over Canada's provinces in the same fashion. It is well known that the French are concentrated in Québec, that the Germans are concentrated in Ontario, the Ukrainians in the Prairie provinces, and so on. One way of comparing the distributions of several groups is by way of an index of segregation. To calculate this index, say to compare the distribution by province of groups A and B, we do the following:

1. Calculate the percentage distributions of the two groups by province.
2. Find the difference between two corresponding percentages (e.g. if Group A has 10% in Nova Scotia, and group B has 1% in Nova Scotia, the difference would be 9%).
3. Sum the differences for all the provinces, ignoring the sign (i.e. if a difference were -9%, we would treat it as +9% for this addition).
4. Divide the sum thus obtained by 2.

The index thus obtained is called the index of dissimilarity, or the index of segregation. A verbal interpretation of the index is that it indicates the percentage of one group which would have to be redistributed for the two groups to have the same distribution. For example, the index of segregation between the British and French ethnic groups, by province, is 70.3. Thus, we would have to move 70.3% of the French, from the province where they are overrepresented (Québec) to the provinces where they are underrepresented (all other provinces) for the British and French ethnic groups to have the same distribution by province.

The following tables give the segregation indices for the main groups, according to ethnic group, mother tongue, and home language. All are based on distributions by province.

TABLE A-21
SEGRATION INDICES OF THE MAJOR ETHNIC GROUPS
FROM THE REMAINDER OF THE POPULATION AND FROM EACH OTHER
BY PROVINCE, CANADA, 1971

ETHNIC GROUP	TOTAL	British Isles	French	German	Italian	Ukrainian	Dutch	Polish	Jewish
British Isles	39.4	—	70.3	26.2	32.4	41.5	14.8	20.6	34.8
French	70.0	70.3	—	76.2	59.0	78.5	76.5	73.6	42.4
German	29.5	26.2	76.2	—	46.4	17.4	15.1	17.2	44.5
Italian	27.7	32.4	59.0	46.4	—	55.9	35.0	33.5	22.1
Ukrainian	41.7	41.5	78.5	17.4	55.9	—	32.1	22.9	54.4
Dutch	29.5	14.8	76.5	15.1	35.0	32.1	—	14.4	36.1
Polish	29.4	20.6	73.6	17.2	33.5	22.9	14.4	—	31.6
Jewish	23.0	34.8	42.4	44.5	22.1	54.4	36.1	31.6	—

Source: 1971 Census of Population,
Bulletin 1.3-2, Table 2.

TABLE A-22
SEGREGATION BETWEEN SELECTED MOTHER-TONGUE GROUPS
BY PROVINCE, CANADA, 1971

MOTHER TONGUE	TOTAL	English	French	German	Italian	Ukrainian	Dutch	Polish	Yiddish
English	22.0	—	78.4	26.6	37.1	43.5	16.8	21.9	43.1
French	56.9	78.4	—	82.0	63.1	84.8	84.0	76.6	44.9
German	34.1	26.6	82.0	—	50.7	18.9	22.6	27.9	44.1
Italian	28.3	37.1	63.1	50.7	—	59.9	32.5	23.3	28.6
Ukrainian	47.2	43.5	84.8	18.9	59.9	—	39.7	37.2	53.4
Dutch	33.6	16.8	84.0	22.6	32.5	39.7	—	17.1	43.9
Polish	30.5	21.9	76.6	27.9	23.3	37.2	17.1	—	31.7
Yiddish	25.7	43.1	44.9	44.1	28.6	53.4	43.9	31.7	—

IMMIGRANT LANGUAGES IN METROPOLITAN AREAS

To get a further insight in the demographic factors affecting the maintenance of immigrant languages, one should inspect data at lower levels of aggregation than the whole country. The following tables are an initial attempt to stimulate such inspection. Seven census metropolitan areas were selected, partly on the basis of their total population size (Montreal and Toronto), partly on the basis of their location in ethnically heterogeneous areas (Winnipeg, Regina, Calgary, Edmonton and Vancouver). For these areas, language maintenance ratios can be calculated, as shown in the first of those tables.

The pattern displayed by those data is rather interesting: almost without exception, Montreal and Toronto show the highest degrees of immigrant language maintenance, while the other metropolitan areas in many cases do not even equal the national averages. To some degree, the pattern appears to be related to the total population size for those metropolitan areas, rather than the size of the ethnic group, or the mother tongue group, in question. For example, if we compare the Germans in Montreal with those in Edmonton, we find that the Montreal Germans show higher mother tongue retention as well as higher home language retention than those in Edmonton, despite the fact that the German ethnic group in Edmonton is far larger than that in Montreal (62,000 in Edmonton, 38,000 in Montreal) and that the number of persons of German mother tongue is almost exactly the same in both areas (approx. 26,000). The pattern is obviously not all that simple, as can be seen by a comparison between Regina and Vancouver.

For a further investigation of the differences between metropolitan areas, the last set of tables compares the data on language maintenance, for selected age-groups, between a metropolitan area in which retention is high and one where retention is low. For comparison, the national figures are given as well.

The patterns displayed by those tables appear to give further hints about the social mechanisms underlying the maintenance of immigrant languages. Generally, the metropolitan areas with high retention tend to have higher retention ratios for all age groups (in comparison with the national data). In other words, the higher overall values for Montreal and Toronto are not the result of a "favorable" age composition. For the areas with the lower retention ratios (that is, lower than the other metropolitan area and, in fact, lower than the national figures), the age-specific data indicate that these metropolitan areas lose out especially in the younger age-groups.

Thus, it appears that the social institutions by which immigrant languages tend to be transmitted from one generation to the next (family of origin, ethnic schools, ethnic press and ethnic voluntary organizations) are functioning most effectively in Montreal and Toronto, and that in the other metropolitan areas, if they function at all, they are not as effective in passing on the immigrant language to the next generation.

TABLE A-23
LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE IN SELECTED METROPOLITAN AREAS
CANADA, 1971

A - MOTHER TONGUE RETENTION RATIOS

METROPOLITAN AREA	ETHNIC GROUP					
	German	Italian	Ukrainian	Dutch	Polish	Jewish
Montreal	67.1	81.6	59.9	40.6	68.7	18.6
Toronto	57.4	81.1	57.6	39.7	62.8	15.4
Winnipeg	56.6	74.5	58.3	32.3	40.3	29.1
Calgary	35.4	68.0	35.0	36.9	29.0	13.0
Edmonton	41.8	74.6	50.3	39.8	30.6	18.3
Regina	35.8	63.8	43.8	21.7	26.9	14.9
Vancouver	47.4	62.4	17.1	37.0	7.9	9.0

B - HOME LANGUAGE RETENTION RATIOS

METROPOLITAN AREA	MOTHER TONGUE					
	German	Italian	Ukrainian	Dutch	Polish	Jewish
Montreal	46.1	81.6	71.8	40.0	61.5	57.4
Toronto	45.2	85.9	64.4	22.7	60.8	56.3
Winnipeg	37.4	73.7	41.6	23.3	44.3	36.1
Calgary	28.9	68.3	26.6	24.3	41.8	44.3
Edmonton	31.7	72.0	33.0	19.9	42.1	25.2
Regina	20.3	60.6	25.1	20.0	28.7	5.2
Vancouver	33.5	64.0	27.2	20.4	37.0	38.9

TABLE A-24

A comparison of mother tongue retention ratios by selected age-groups, between a "low-assimilation" metropolitan area, a "high-assimilation" metropolitan area, and the total country, 1971.

A - GERMAN ETHNIC ORIGIN			
BIRTH YEAR	Montreal	Edmonton	Canada
1967-1971	35.2	16.0	20.7
1962-1966	35.0	18.6	20.1
1957-1961	36.2	23.5	23.0
1952-1956	43.3	27.8	27.1
1947-1951	49.5	25.8	29.6
1942-1946	68.7	41.8	38.4
1937-1941	82.4	63.7	50.6
1932-1936	88.3	66.2	58.3
1927-1931	90.6	75.7	62.9
1922-1926	106.2	83.7	62.3
1917-1921	102.6	82.9	57.0
All ages	67.1	41.8	42.6

B - UKRAINIAN ETHNIC ORIGIN			
BIRTH YEAR	Montreal	Vancouver	Canada
1967-1971	31.2	2.9	19.5
1962-1966	33.7	2.2	21.7
1957-1961	42.1	2.9	26.6
1952-1956	47.3	4.6	33.2
1947-1951	45.7	8.0	34.4
1942-1946	44.4	15.1	40.8
1937-1941	59.1	24.1	52.7
1932-1936	72.0	22.2	63.0
1927-1931	82.8	29.7	68.8
1922-1926	94.8	32.5	76.0
1917-1921	91.0	44.0	76.8
All ages	59.9	17.1	53.4

C - POLISH ETHNIC ORIGIN			
BIRTH YEAR	Toronto	Vancouver	Canada
1967-1971	33.3	2.4	16.3
1962-1966	30.1	3.3	16.6
1957-1961	32.3	2.7	18.9
1952-1956	42.0	2.9	25.9
1947-1951	50.0	4.3	31.5
1942-1946	48.1	6.2	28.9
1937-1941	71.6	8.9	34.0
1932-1936	88.6	10.6	41.8
1927-1931	96.5	15.1	56.3
1922-1926	93.2	16.9	66.7
1917-1921	92.0	17.1	68.7
All ages	62.8	7.9	42.7

TABLE A-25

A comparison of home language retention ratios by selected age-groups, between a "low-assimilation" metropolitan area, a "high-assimilation" metropolitan area, and the total country, 1971.

A - GERMAN MOTHER TONGUE

BIRTH YEAR	Montreal	Edmonton	Canada
1967-1971	81.0	61.1	76.4
1962-1966	52.7	37.1	54.8
1957-1961	42.7	29.6	43.3
1952-1956	44.2	25.8	37.2
1947-1951	38.6	16.1	31.2
1942-1946	40.8	23.4	31.8
1937-1941	40.0	30.2	32.2
1932-1936	48.5	32.1	29.8
1927-1931	52.1	34.2	31.8
1922-1926	51.5	43.5	33.4
1917-1921	49.0	46.1	32.5
All ages	46.1	31.7	38.0

B - UKRAINIAN MOTHER TONGUE

BIRTH YEAR	Montreal	Vancouver	Canada
1967-1971	82.3	*	52.8
1962-1966	75.9	*	43.7
1957-1961	77.4	22.6	45.9
1952-1956	82.2	35.3	43.4
1947-1951	71.3	19.5	35.7
1942-1946	43.6	9.0	24.7
1937-1941	52.7	6.7	21.7
1932-1936	66.6	16.4	21.8
1927-1931	77.4	31.6	28.7
1922-1926	95.1	56.1	44.8
1917-1921	90.6	66.7	39.3
All ages	71.8	27.2	46.7

* Indicates that the base -i.e. the number of persons of Ukrainian mother tongue- is less than 100.

C - POLISH MOTHER TONGUE

BIRTH YEAR	Toronto	Vancouver	Canada
1967-1971	95.6	*	83.7
1962-1966	64.9	54.2	61.3
1957-1961	62.9	45.8	52.1
1952-1956	62.6	50.0	54.4
1947-1951	57.0	39.5	49.1
1942-1946	56.0	25.9	41.5
1937-1941	54.9	29.6	42.4
1932-1936	55.7	36.3	39.4
1927-1931	58.8	39.7	44.0
1922-1926	72.4	29.4	50.2
1917-1921	76.1	41.4	47.5
All ages	60.8	37.0	52.6

* Indicates that there were fewer than 100 persons of Polish mother tongue for that age-group.

A study of broad scope and of significance for both analyses and practical policy concerning "non-official" languages appeared in the summer 1975, just as this data book was being completed, so that we did not have the time to produce a useful summary of its findings. The full reference is as follows:

K.G. O'Bryan, J.G. Reitz and O. Kuplowska,
Non-Official Languages: a Study in Multiculturalism.
Ottawa: Minister Responsible for Multiculturalism,
1975. 538 pages.

Copies may be ordered through:

M. Andrassy, Director,
Multiculturalism Programme,
130 Slater Street,
Ottawa, K1A 0M5.

The study is based upon a large number of detailed and systematic interviews with representative samples of ten ethnic groups in five metropolitan areas: Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Edmonton, and Vancouver. Measures of language attitudes and behaviour were related to such variables as generation, education, and income. The findings reveal significant differences among the groups studied on many counts, but draw attention to widespread support for non-official language retention, even among many who do not make regular use of a non-official language.

PART B
NATIVE LANGUAGE DATA

NATIVE LANGUAGES

To our knowledge there is no published study on the question of 'language demography' among Canada's Native peoples which permits us to compare Native language maintenance and shift for different regions of the country.* There are publications which list the tribal and linguistic affiliations of Indians in Canada, but these provide no information on the extent to which the various Native languages are being maintained in different parts of the country. We shall try to provide some information on this topic after some general observations on demographic features of the Native population.

Every socio-economic survey carried out over the years shows that the Native people are the least advantaged of Canada's groups in terms of education, employment, and income. It is obvious that the lack of competence in English or French is an important determinant of their socio-economic status, but the published Census data do not permit us to assess this factor with any degree of precision.

In fact, the Census gives us little information on important aspects of Native languages. For instance, it does not differentiate among Native Indian languages nor does it separate out at the level of Census division and sub-division the Indians from the Inuit (Eskimo). In perusing the tables that follow and the comments based upon them, one should keep in mind the problems of Census data limitations described earlier (Part A, pages 11-17). We have in mind particularly errors of coverage, of response and non-response, and of uncertainty associated with data from small population aggregates.

Table B-1 shows that the Native people of Canada is a fast-growing component of the population. Their growth is due to a high rate of natural increase - higher than any other ethnic origin in Canada, because they gain hardly any additional members through immigration. It should also be pointed out that the Census almost certainly underestimates the numbers of people who identify themselves with Indian origin. Prior to the 1951 Census people of mixed Indian and non-Indian parentage (e.g. Métis) were included in the Native origin population if they declared that origin. However in the 1951, 1961, and 1971 Censuses, people of mixed parentage were counted in the same way as other ethnic groups, i.e., through the line of the father. Because the marriage of an Indian woman to a non-Indian

* Later we cite the only report in this category which we could find and it has yet to be published: Maria Barrados and Martha Burd Van Dine, "Multilingualism of Natives in the MacKenzie District: an Analysis of Data from the Northern Manpower Survey Program," Ottawa: Northern Research Group, D.I.A.N.D. (forthcoming).

TABLE B-1 - POPULATION COUNTS OF THE NATIVE PEOPLES

Year	Registered Indian Population*	Census of Canada**		
		Year	Indians	Inuit
1929	108,012	1881	108,547	-
1934	112,510	1901	127,941	-
1939	118,378	1911	105,492	119
1944	125,686	1921	110,814	2,910
1949	136,407	1931	122,911	5,979
1954	151,558	1941	118,316	7,205
1959	179,126	1951	155,874	9,733
1960	185,169	1961	208,286	11,835
1961	191,709	1971	295,215	17,550
1966	224,164			
1971	257,619			

Source: Perspective Canada, 1974, page 240.

* Registered Indians are those descended in the male line from persons who were considered to be Indians or who were members of an Indian Band on May 26, 1874. The wives or widows of registered Indians are also considered as "registered". Registered Indians are the only ones recognized by the Canadian Government as coming under the Indian Act. Population figures for this category are from the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

** The Census reports those of Native Indian or Inuit ethnic origin, whether they are "registered" or not.

TABLE B-2 - INDIAN AND INUIT POPULATION BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE

URBAN AND RURAL DISTRIBUTION	1961	1971*	PROVINCIAL DISTRIBUTION - 1971			
			Province	Indians	Inuit	Indians & Inuit
Rural	87.1	69.3	Newfoundland	0.4	6.0	0.7
Farm	6.8	3.9	Prince Edward Island	0.1	-	0.1
Non-Farm	80.3	65.4	Nova Scotia	1.5	0.1	1.4
Urban	12.9	30.7	New Brunswick	1.3	--	1.3
Cities of:			Québec	11.1	21.4	11.7
100,000+	6.6	15.9	Ontario	21.2	4.3	20.2
30,000-99,999	1.3	2.9	Manitoba	14.6	0.7	13.8
10,000-29,999	1.1	4.5	Saskatchewan	13.7	0.4	13.0
5,000- 9,999	0.8	2.0	Alberta	15.1	0.8	14.3
2,500- 4,999	0.9	1.6	British Columbia	17.7	1.2	16.8
1,000- 2,499	2.2	3.8	Yukon	0.9	0.1	0.8
TOTALS	100.0	100.0	Northwest Territories	2.4	65.0	5.9
Number	220,121	295,215	CANADA	100.0	100.0	100.0
			Number	295,215	17,550	312,765

* Indians only in 1971

Source: Perspective Canada, 1974.

TABLE B-3 - CULTURE AREAS, LINGUISTIC GROUPS AND THEIR LOCATIONS, NATIVE INDIANS

Culture areas	Linguistic Group	Location
Algonkian	Algonkian	Eastern and Central woodlands
Iroquoian	Iroquoian	Southern Québec and Southeastern Ontario
Plains	Algonkian	Prairies
	Athapaskan	
	Siouan	
Plateau	Salishan	Interior plateau of British Columbia and Yukon
	Athapaskan	
	Tlingit	
Pacific Coast	Kootenayan	Coast of British Columbia
	Tsimshian	
	Haida	
	Salishan	
Mackenzie	Wakashan	Mackenzie River system and woodlands north of Churchill River
	Athapaskan	

Source: Perspective Canada, 1974, page 240.

man results in her children's loss of registered Indian status, this would depress the number of people who are reported as of Indian origin, no matter how strongly they identify themselves as "Indian".

Tables B-2 and B-3 show that Native people are found in every Province and Territory. However, they are highly segregated in three senses: 1) the majority live on reserves or, where there are no reserves, in communities with high proportions of Native peoples; 2) they tend to cluster in certain neighbourhoods in towns and cities into which they are moving in growing numbers; 3) the majority live in rural, non-farm regions in the northerly parts of the country, at some distance from the heavily populated belt to the south.

NATIVE LANGUAGE USAGE

The following trends and patterns can be seen in Tables B-4 to B-7. Comparisons of the 1951 with the 1971 Census figures shows a pronounced decrease in the percentages of those of Native origin who report a Native language as mother tongue. This mother-tongue 'shift' is particularly pronounced for the Indians, those of Inuit origin having comparatively high mother-tongue retention (Table B-6). As we point out below, this generalization does not hold true for the Indians and Inuit in some areas.

Because the home-language question was not asked in Censuses prior to 1971, we cannot compare data on this question over time. The percentage of persons of Native origin who report a Native language as the home language is only 44% (Table B-5). However, 77% of those with a Native mother tongue report a Native home language. There is a striking difference between rural and urban residents in both mother tongue and home language, as can be seen in Tables B-5 and B-7. Those living in urban places use a Native language much less than those in rural places. Interesting age differences are to be observed in Table B-7: those in the school ages and up to about 49 have lower Native mother-tongue and home-language ratios than the very youngest and those above 49. Again we note the greater use of their mother tongue in the home among the Inuit (Table B-6).

That the higher retention rates and home language use of Inuit is due to factors other than the nature of the language, as such, is evident from Table B-8, which shows that Mackenzie District Inuit, more than any of the Indians in that District, use English as the language of the home. In their analysis, Barrados and Van Dine (see Footnote, page 43) were able to show that the single most important factor influencing language use was the extent to which a language was the dominant mother tongue of an area. After determining which language dominated a particular area in the

TABLE B-4
NATIVE INDIAN - ESKIMO ETHNIC ORIGIN
WITH INDIAN-ESKIMO MOTHER TONGUE (MT)
CANADA, 1951, 1961, 1971

	1951	1961	1971
Ind-Esk Ethnic Origin	164,609	220,221	312,765
Ind-Esk MT	144,787	166,531	178,540
Ratio of Ind-Esk Origin with Ind-Esk MT	.87	.75	.57

TABLE B-5
NATIVE INDIAN - ESKIMO ETHNIC ORIGIN,
MOTHER TONGUE AND LANGUAGE MOST OFTEN SPOKEN
AT HOME (HL), CANADA, RURAL AND URBAN, 1971

	Canada	Urban	Rural
Ind-Esk Origin	312,765 (100%)	94,170 (30%)	218,590 (70%)
Ratio of Ind-Esk MT	.57	.33	.69
Ratio of Ind-Esk MT with Ind-Esk HL	.77	.53	.81
Ratio of Ind-Esk Origin with Ind-Esk HL	.44	.16	.56

TABLE B-6
INUIT (ESKIMO) ORIGIN, MOTHER TONGUE (MT) AND
HOME LANGUAGE (HL),
CANADA AND SELECTED REGIONS, 1971

	1	2	3	4
	Inuit Origin	Ratio of (1) Inuit MT	Ratio of (1) Inuit HL	Ratio of (2) Inuit HL
Canada	17,550	.87	.86	.98
Newfoundland (Labrador)	1,055	.91	.80	.83
Québec	3,755	.98	.97	1.00
N.W.T	11,400	.91	.84	.93
Remainder of Canada	1,345	.35	.38	1.00

TABLE B-7
NATIVE INDIAN-ESKIMO ORIGIN' MOTHER TONGUE (MT) AND HOME LANGUAGE (HL)
BY AGE GROUP, CANADA, RURAL AND URBAN, 1971

CANADA		TOTAL	0-9	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65 & Over
(1)	Ind-Esk Origin	312,765	98,195	76,340	48,900	32,415	22,605	21,420	12,965
(2)	Ratio of (1) Ind-Esk MT	.57	.55	.54	.53	.61	.63	.67	.71
(3)	Ratio of (1) Ind-Esk HL	.44	.45	.41	.37	.42	.46	.48	.64
(4)	Ratio of (2) Ind-Esk HL	.77	.82	.76	.71	.69	.73	.71	.90
RURAL									
(1)	Ind-Esk Origin	218,590	73,140	55,485	29,090	20,980	15,175	15,155	9,570
(2)	Ratio of (1) Ind-Esk MT	.69	.66	.64	.69	.74	.76	.80	.84
(3)	Ratio of (1) Ind-Esk HL	.56	.56	.51	.53	.56	.59	.65	.73
(4)	Ratio of (2) Ind-Esk HL	.81	.86	.80	.77	.75	.78	.81	.87
URBAN									
(1)	Ind-Esk Origin	94,170	25,050	20,860	19,820	11,430	7,435	6,255	3,320
(2)	Ratio of (1) Ind-Esk MT	.33	.23	.27	.29	.37	.36	.42	.45
(3)	Ratio of (1) Ind-Esk HL	.16	.13	.14	.14	.17	.18	.23	.38
(4)	Ratio of (2) Ind-Esk HL	.53	.55	.52	.48	.45	.50	.56	.84

TABLE B-8
(From page 26, Barrados and Van Dine)

MOTHER TONGUE BY LANGUAGE USED MOST OFTEN AT HOME
FOR NATIVE RESIDENTS IN THE MACKENZIE DISTRICT*

MOTHER TONGUE	LANGUAGE USED MOST OFTEN AT HOME			
	Mother Tongue	Native Language not mother tongue	English	Row Totals
Dogrib	95%	1%	4%	100% (648)
Slavey	80%	-	20%	100% (1120)
Chipewyan	52%	3%	45%	100% (335)
Loucheux	35%	1%	64%	100% (205)
Other Indian Languages	36%	1%	63%	100% (183)
Eskimo	31%	-	69%	100% (644)
English	-	3%	97%	100% (851)

Source of data: The Northern Manpower Survey Program:
the 1970 Survey of the Mackenzie.

* The questions used were "What language did you first speak as a child?" and "What language is most often spoken in your home?"

The numbers in parenthesis refer to the number of respondents in each category.

Mackenzie District in terms of its proportion mother-tongue, they derived an index which they called the "language use ratio", by dividing the number with a particular mother tongue into the number who still spoke that mother tongue in the home. The results are presented in Table B-9. This table shows that, with the exception of Inuit, "a Native language has a lower language use ratio in a linguistic area where it is not the dominant language (and that) the language use ratio of a native linguistic group is lower in areas where there is a high proportion of natives with English as their mother tongue." (31) For example, the Dogrib have the highest language use ratio possible (1.00) in the Dogrib area, but for the Dogrib speakers outside of their area there was a shift away from the use of their language at home.

Table B-10 presents data from Census publications on Native Indian mother-tongue retention and home language use. Map I should be consulted when reading this table, for it helps locate the Census divisions and the different Native languages. We do not vouch for the validity and accuracy of the figures (see page 14 on Census limitations) or for the Native languages used in every district. For example, some areas are very much heterogeneous linguistically, making it impossible with the sparse data available to isolate a dominant Native Indian language.

Extreme variations among Census divisions and groups are found in Table B-10. The most obvious general pattern is the differentiation between northerly and southerly areas of the country, reflecting (among other things) rural-urban differences and variations in Native language density. However, there are several exceptions which should make us cautious about sweeping generalizations on Native language usage. In British Columbia and the Yukon, Native mother-tongue retention and home-language usage are generally low and the north-south variation is not as pronounced as it is elsewhere. Furthermore, there are a few groups in the southerly parts of the country with high mother-tongue retention and home-language ratios (e.g., the Blackfoot in Alberta Census Division 5, and the Micmac of Kent and Northumberland Counties in New Brunswick).

PROGRAMS PROMOTING NATIVE LANGUAGE RESTORATION AND MAINTENANCE

There is a keen interest by all authorities involved - federal, provincial, and native - in the problem of the survival of native languages and cultures, and various programs have been launched to enable that survival.

TABLE B-9
(From page 32, Barrados and Van Dine)

LANGUAGE USE RATIOS OF LINGUISTIC AREAS
FOR NATIVE RESIDENTS IN THE MACKENZIE DISTRICT

LINGUISTIC AREA	LANGUAGE USE RATIO*
<u>Dogrib Area (including Detah)</u>	
Dogrib (565)	1.00
Slave (10)	.80
<u>Slave Area</u>	
Slave (874)	.83
English (33)	.79
<u>Chipewyan Area</u>	
Chipewyan (265)	.55
Slave (14)	.21
Other Indian (108)	.38
Eskimo (10)	.40
English (247)	.96
<u>Loucheux Area</u>	
Loucheux (182)	.37
Eskimo (94)	.34
English (247)	.98
<u>Eskimo Area (including Inuvik)</u>	
Eskimo (523)	.31
English (103)	.99
Loucheux (19)	.21
<u>English Area (Hay River, Pine Point, Yellowknife)</u>	
Dogrib (61)	.67
Slave (126)	.69
Chipewyan (65)	.40
Other Indian (65)	.37
Eskimo (17)	.18
English (199)	.99

Source of data: The Northern Manpower Survey Program:
the 1970 Survey of the Mackenzie.

*LANGUAGE USE RATIO

$$\frac{\text{number who still speak their mother tongue in the home}}{\text{number whose mother tongue is this language}}$$

TABLE B-10 - NATIVE INDIAN ORIGIN, MOTHER TONGUE (MT)
AND HOME LANGUAGE, CANADA, PROVINCES AND CENSUS
DIVISIONS WITH 500 or MORE INDIAN ORIGIN, 1971

PROVINCE and CENSUS DIVISION	Ratio 1 Native Indian Origin	Ratio 2 of (1) Indian MT	Ratio 3 of (1) Indian HL	Ratio 4 of (2) Indian HL	Native Language
CANADA	295,215	.56	.41	.74	
Newfoundland	1,225	.53	.53	.99	
Labrador	690	.81	.84	1.00	
Prince Edward Island	(Fewer than 500 Indian Origin)				Montagnais
Nova Scotia	4,475	.60	.51	.85	
Cape Breton	1,570	.81	.81	.96	Micmac
Halifax	580	.12	.05	.42	Micmac
New Brunswick	3,915	.69	.61	.87	
Kent	980	.95	.95	1.00	Micmac
Northumberland	960	.95	.87	.91	Micmac
York	690	.52	.28	.55	Malecite
Québec	32,835	.53	.45	.85	
Abitibi	4,580	.98	.89	.92	Cree
Bonaventure	1,210	.83	.66	.79	Micmac
Chambly	540	.03	.03	1.00	Mohawk
Champlain	685	.68	.69	1.00	Algonkin & Abenakis
Compton	505	—	—	—	Abenakis (?)
Gatineau	810	.50	.40	.80	Algonkin
Huntingdon	740	?	?	?	Mohawk (?)
Ile-de-Montréal & Ile-Jésus	5,140	.09	.12	1.00	Mixed
Lac-St-Jean-Ouest	1,090	.32	.29	.90	Montagnais
Laprairie	3,230	.48	.28	.59	Mohawk
Maskinongé	720	.98	.97	.99	Algonkin
Québec	1,510	.04	.03	.80	Huron & Mixed
Saguenay	6,550*	.96	.91	.95	Montagnais & Mixed
Témiscamingue	785	.38	.19	.47	Algonkin
Ontario	62,415	.45	.33	.73	
Algoma	3,505	.37	.22	.62	Ojibway
Brant	4,045	.17	.09	.52	Various Iroquoian
Bruce	915	.48	.31	.65	Ojibway
Cochrane	3,500	.82	.62	.76	Ojibway & Ottawa
Essex	740	.16	.08	.50	Ojibway & Potawatomi
Haldimand	895	.22	.15	.68	Ojibway
Hastings	1,370	.06	.01	.27	Ojibway
Kenora	11,180	.93	.85	.92	Ojibway & Cree
Lambton	2,690	.24	.04	.17	Ojibway
Manitoulin	2,950	.79	.06	.75	Ojibway & Ottawa
Middlesex	2,385	.19	.08	.41	Ojibway & Various Iroquoian
Niagara	915	.16	.07	.41	Ojibway & Various Iroquoian
Nipissing	1,095	.31	.14	.46	Ojibway & Ottawa
Ontario	790	.25	.17	.67	Ojibway
Ottawa-Carleton	1,030	.20	.13	.64	Mixed
Parry Sound	765	.48	.28	.58	Ojibway
Peterborough	780	.36	.12	.35	Ojibway
Rainy River	1,810	.52	.40	.77	Ojibway
Renfrew	575	.09	.01	.18	Ojibway & Algonkin
Simcoe	930	.36	.29	.80	Ojibway
Stormont	655	.77	.53	.81	Mohawk
Sudbury	1,365	.35	.10	.28	Ojibway & Ottawa
Thunderbay	4,795	.52	.37	.71	Ojibway
Toronto	5,540	.23	.18	.79	Mixed
Wentworth	1,700	.14	.07	.50	Various Iroquoian
York	510	.09	.17	.90	Ojibway

TABLE B-10 (cont'd.)

PROVINCE and CENSUS DIVISION	Ratio 1 Native Indian Origin	Ratio 2 of (1) Indian MT	Ratio 3 of (1) Indian HL	Ratio 4 of (2) Indian HL	Native Language
Manitoba	43,030	.73	.58	.80	
Division No. 5	750	.23	.04	.18	Ojibway
Division No. 6	1,040	.72	.24	.34	Ojibway & Siouan
Division No. 7	540	.57	.24	.42	Ojibway & Siouan
Division No. 8	1,100	.83	.66	.80	Ojibway & Siouan
Division No. 11	880	.76	.32	.43	Ojibway
Division No. 12	3,740	.51	.47	.93	Ojibway & Cree
Division No. 15	500	.54	.29	.54	Ojibway
Division No. 16	20,825	.93	.83	.89	Ojibway, Cree & Chipewyan
Division No. 18	2,795	.70	.64	.92	Ojibway
Division No. 19	2,205	.50	.22	.45	Ojibway
Division No. 20	6,420	.39	.55	.21	Mixed (Winnipeg)
Saskatchewan	40,470	.64	.51	.81	
Division No. 1	665	.33	.02	.07	Cree, Ojibway & Assiniboine
Division No. 5	1,270	.18	.07	.43	Cree, Ojibway (Regina)
Division No. 6	5,560	.21	.05	.26	Cree, Ojibway, Siouan & Assiniboine
Division No. 9	1,735	.18	.09	.49	Cree & Ojibway
Division No. 10	1,980	.18	.18	1.00	Cree & Ojibway
Division No. 11	1,465	.40	.16	.40	Cree & Siouan
Division No. 12	1,245	.72	.72	1.00	Cree, Ojibway & Assiniboine
Division No. 13	875	.92	.92	1.00	Cree, Ojibway & Assiniboine
Division No. 14	1,740	.89	.80	.90	Cree
Division No. 15	3,455	.64	.35	.56	Cree
Division No. 16	4,135	.67	.59	.88	Cree
Division No. 17	3,575	.88	.68	.77	Cree & Ojibway
Division No. 18	11,915	.94	.84	.89	Chipewyan & Cree
Alberta	44,545	.67	.48	.73	
Division No. 2	710	.56	.18	.32	Blackfoot
Division No. 3	5,015	.66	.55	.84	Blackfoot
Division No. 5	1,780	.91	.73	.80	Blackfoot
Division No. 6	3,015	.31	.16	.80	Assiniboine & Mixed
Division No. 8	2,025	.80	.73	.92	Cree
Division No. 9	2,160	.93	.93	1.00	Assiniboine & Cree
Division No. 11	7,575	.45	.21	.47	Assiniboine & Cree
Division No. 12	8,425	.76	.57	.75	Chipewyan & Cree
Division No. 13	1,320	.73	.60	.82	Cree
Division No. 14	585	.52	.11	.70	Cree
Division No. 15	11,375	.74	.55	.74	Beaver, Cree & Slave
British Columbia	52,215	.35	.16	.48	
Alberta-Clayoquot	2,095	.41	.04	.11	Nootka
Bulkley-Nechako	3,255	.72	.39	.54	Carrier (Victoria)
Capital	2,115	.18	.07	.41	Mixed
Cariboo	2,935	.59	.46	.79	Carrier & Shuswap
Comox-Strathcona	1,470	.30	.13	.45	Kwakiutl
Cowichan Valley	2,405	.23	.12	.53	Cowichan
Dewdney-Alouette	535	.16	.27	.27	Cowichan
Fraser-Cheam	2,025	.13	.43	.44	Cowichan
Fraser-Fort George	1,835	.28	.05	.20	Carrier
Greater Vancouver	6,865	.20	.07	.39	Mixed
Kitimat-Stikine	6,220	.47	.29	.62	Kwakiutl
Mount Waddington	1,430	.47	.29	.63	Kwakiutl
Namaimo	840	.20	.04	.23	Cowichan
North Okanagan	700	.32	.17	.55	Shuswap
Ocean Falls	1,370	.23	.02	.09	Various
Okanagan-Similkameen	700	.46	.10	.23	Okanagan
Peace River-Liard	2,560	.63	.34	.54	Beaver
Powell River	525	.78	.70	.90	Beaver
Skeena	4,335	.15	.05	.90	Haida & Tsimshian
Squamish-Lillooet	1,675	.25	.07	.30	Squamish
Thompson-Nicola	3,665	.37	.11	.31	Shuswap
Yukon	2,580	.39	.16	.41	Kuchin & Nahani
Northwest Territories	7,180	.75	.53	.70	See Tables B-8 and B-9

The immediate central issue for programs of maintenance and restoration of native languages is education in the mother tongue, and thus, in a closely related way, language standardization.

Much work has been done privately and by the federal and provincial governments to develop curricula and educational materials for the teaching of native languages and the history and culture of native peoples, and for the gradual introduction of English as a second language, for native children.

It is chiefly the federal government which is responsible for native education. It followed a policy of integrating native education into provincial systems until 1972 when native peoples persuaded the government to adopt the policy of native control for native education. A recent publication of the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, which enumerates many existing programs in education, Curriculum Development: Schools Programs Natives Studies - Native Languages, contains this summary of the situation in native education:

Indian and Inuit teachers now make up almost 20 per cent of the teaching force. In addition, approximately 1300 native para-professionals work as teacher-assistants, social counsellors, counsellor technicians, home and school co-ordinators, child-care workers and native language instructors. There are Indian superintendents of education, Indian principals and Indian administrators of student residences.

Local school or education committees assist in directing the educational program in close to 250 of the approximately 300 federal schools situated on reserves. In addition to this, 57 Indian representatives with full voting privileges are serving on provincial or parochial school boards.

During the past three years, local curriculum committees have been organized to advise specifically on the cultural content of the school program and to assist in the development of relevant teaching materials. Some 52 of these committees have now been established and many more are in the planning stages. Classroom consultants offer advisory services to teachers, principals, superintendents and curriculum committees and of a total of 25 classroom consultants with special skills and training in intercultural education, nine are Indian and one is Inuit.

There are 54 different Indian languages or dialects spoken across Canada and there has been a dramatic increase in the number of native language programs offered in the schools over the past five years. From a single Mohawk program offered on the Caughnawaga reserve near Montreal during

1969-70, 174 federal schools and 34 provincial schools are now offering programs in a total of 23 different languages. The instructors for these programs are all native people identified by their local Chief and Band Council for their fluency in the language and their ability to relate to young people. If necessary, the instructors attend training programs to help develop their teaching skills. They are then hired by the Band to teach the native language in the school.*

* Indian and Northern Affairs, Curriculum Development: School Programs - Native Studies - Native Languages, page 1.

TABLE B-10 - NATIVE LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

REGION	Program		1974-75		Languages Taught
	Initiated		No. of Schools		
	Year	School	Federal	Provincial	
Maritimes	1971-72	1	5	2	Micmac, Maliseet
Québec	1969-70	1	24	6	Mohawk, Algonquin, Cree, Montagnais, Micmac, Attikmewk, Inuit
Ontario	1969-70	6 (adult classes)	60	12	Ojibway, Cayuga, Mohawk, Cree, Delaware, Oneida
Manitoba	1971-72	6	13	4	Cree, Dakota, Ojibway
Saskatchewan	1972-73	5	40	2	Cree, Dakota
Alberta	1971-72	1	23	6	Slavey, Cree, Stoney, Blackfoot, Chipewyan
B.C.	1971-72	1	9	2	Songish, Niska, Tsimshiam, Carrier, Cowichan, Lillooet, Shuswap

Federal Schools:	174	Languages Taught:	23
Provincial Schools:	34		
TOTAL:	208		

Source: Indian and Northern Affairs, Curriculum Development: School Programs: Native Studies - Native Languages, page 16.

There has been considerable activity in the field of linguistics concerning native languages (see University of Manitoba, Anthropology papers, No. 11, Bibliography of Algonquian Linguistics, Sept. 1974).

Language identification, orthography and standardization are very important in the minds of native leaders as well as scholars, see for example, the Inuit Language Commission established by the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada (Inuit Tapirisat Report for 1974).

Programs aimed at supporting native culture have also been launched (e.g. the Inuit Cultural Institute). Here the central importance of education is again recognized. Attention focuses on cultural history, life-skills and the relation of native people to the dominant culture.

A Canadian Indian Bibliography, 1960-1970 (Thomas S. Abler and Sally M. Weaver, University of Toronto Press, 1974) lists material of scholarly interest on the Canadian Indian and Métis.

Readers may wish to take note that the Bulletin, Vol. 16, No. 2, July 1975, of the Canadian Association in Support of the Native Peoples (251 Laurier Avenue, Ottawa) contains several articles on language-related matters and Indian education.

PART C
OFFICIAL LANGUAGE DATA

THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Section A included some information on the Official Language of Canada, English and French, but only in comparison with other languages. This section focusses on English and French and mentions other languages only insofar as they have a bearing on the two official languages.

There are many more published reports analyzing trends in official languages (official bilingualism, language maintenance and shift) than there are for immigrant and native languages. Since the late 1960's and the reports of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, there have been several published studies and unpublished papers on the topic of the official languages, with particular attention being paid to the issue of French language survival both within and outside Québec.

In this section we supplement the material taken directly from published Census reports with material from a number of other sources, all of which make use of the Census, but each of which provides its own manipulation of the Census data. We acknowledge particularly the ideas and findings of Richard Joy, whose work we cite on several occasions, and the findings of the Bilingual Districts Advisory Board, with particular acknowledgment of the help of Neil Morrison, Donald Cartwright and William F. Mackey, all of whom are connected in one way or another with this Board.

Until the advent of Bill 22 in Québec, there was no perceived 'threat' to the maintenance of the English language in Canada. And if there is now a real threat to the English language in Québec, that is the only place where such a threat lies. On the other hand, the maintenance of the French language is problematic outside Québec and, according to some authorities, even within it.

In examining the status and prospects of the French language in Canada, many researchers have taken the lead provided by Richard Joy in his Languages in Conflict in separating out several language zones in terms of the relative strength of English and French language. At the most general level, we differentiate three zones: the heartland of Québec, where French clearly dominates; the bilingual belt, where French and English intermingle in various modes of strength; and the remainder of the country

which, while either homogeneous English or heterogeneous with reference to mother tongues, was nevertheless English-speaking in terms of the 'public language'. In other words, in the latter zone, French is hardly heard. Now these three basic zones can be sub-divided further, depending on the level of analysis required for the purposes in mind. The procedure followed in this Section is to present patterns and trends with reference to the country as a whole and then for different groupings within it.

CANADA AND THE PROVINCES

Table C-1 shows that, for the country as a whole, the percentage English mother tongue has increased steadily since 1941, while the percentage French and 'Other' mother tongues have decreased, the more substantial decrease being for the French. For the Official Languages, the percentage speaking English Only is very stable since 1941. The percentage speaking French Only has been decreasing since 1951, while the percentage speaking neither English nor French shows a small but steady increase. The most notable increase is in percentage who are bilingual in the Official Languages, although the extent of this increase is in question (see above, p. 20, 'Questionable Editing Procedures').

Table C-2 shows that the trend towards a decline in French mother tongue for Canada as a whole holds for every Province except Newfoundland and British Columbia between 1961 and 1971. The tiny increases in those Provinces are almost certainly due to the migration of persons of French mother tongue to the Labrador portion of Newfoundland and to British Columbia. In the Province of Quebec there was a very slight decrease between 1961 and 1971 in English mother tongue and an increase in 'Other' mother tongues for the same period. On the Official Language question, the English Only percentages increase in some Provinces, decrease in others, in most cases by very small magnitudes. The most interesting English Only change of substance are their decreases in Quebec, Ontario, and British Columbia, and their increase in the Northwest Territories. The French Only category declines in every Province between 1961 and 1971. However, as we see later (Table C-9), an exception is South and West Quebec where a slight increase in French Only is registered. New Brunswick and Quebec show the largest increases in Official Bilinguals, while the Neither English nor French category is very stable, the only marked change being in the Northwest Territories.

TABLE C-1 - MOTHER TONGUE AND OFFICIAL LANGUAGE
CANADA, 1941-71

MOTHER TONGUE					OFFICIAL LANGUAGE				
	1941*	1951	1961	1971		1941	1951	1961	1971
English	56.4	59.1	58.5	60.2	English only	67.2	67.0	67.4	67.1
French	29.2	29.0	28.1	26.9	French only	19.0	19.6	19.1	18.0
Other	14.4	11.9	13.4	12.9	Both	12.8	12.3	12.2	13.4
					Neither	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.5

* Exclusive of Newfoundland

Sources: Catalogue 92-275, Vol. 1, Part 3 (Bulletin 1.3-4), and
Catalogue 92-276, Vol. 1, Part 3 (Bulletin 1.3-5).

TABLE C-2- MOTHER TONGUE AND OFFICIAL LANGUAGE
CANADA AND PROVINCES, 1961-71
(1961 Figures in Brackets)

Canada and Provinces	MOTHER TONGUE			OFFICIAL LANGUAGE			
	English	French	Other	English only	French only	Both	Neither
CANADA	(58.5) 60.1	(28.1) 26.8	(13.4) 13.0	(67.4) 67.0	(19.1) 17.9	(12.2) 13.4	(1.3) 1.4
Newfoundland	(98.6) 98.5	(0.6) 0.7	(0.8) 0.7	(98.4) 97.9	(0.1) 0.1	(1.1) 1.7	(0.2) 0.1
Prince Edward Island	(91.3) 92.3	(7.6) 6.6	(1.1) 1.1	(91.0) 91.2	(1.1) 0.6	(7.5) 8.1	(0.1) -
Nova Scotia	(92.2) 92.9	(5.4) 5.0	(2.4) 2.0	(92.9) 92.6	(0.8) 0.5	(6.1) 6.7	(0.1) 0.1
New Brunswick	(63.3) 64.6	(35.2) 34.0	(1.5) 1.3	(62.0) 62.5	(18.7) 15.9	(18.9) 21.4	(0.2) -
Québec	(13.2) 13.0	(81.1) 80.7	(5.7) 6.1	(11.5) 10.4	(61.8) 60.8	(25.4) 27.6	(1.0) 1.0
Ontario	(77.5) 77.5	(6.8) 6.2	(15.7) 16.2	(88.9) 87.2	(1.5) 1.2	(7.9) 9.3	(1.5) 2.2
Manitoba	(63.4) 67.0	(6.6) 6.1	(30.0) 26.8	(89.6) 89.2	(0.8) 0.5	(7.4) 8.1	(2.1) 2.0
Saskatchewan	(68.9) 74.0	(3.9) 3.4	(27.2) 22.5	(93.5) 93.6	(0.4) 0.2	(4.5) 4.9	(1.4) 1.2
Alberta	(72.2) 77.6	(3.1) 2.8	(24.7) 19.5	(94.1) 93.7	(0.4) 0.2	(4.2) 4.9	(1.1) 1.1
British Columbia	(80.9) 82.7	(1.6) 1.7	(17.5) 15.5	(95.3) 94.0	(0.1) -	(3.5) 4.6	(1.0) 1.2
Yukon	(74.3) 83.4	(3.0) 2.4	(22.7) 14.0	(93.5) 93.2	(0.2) -	(5.6) 6.5	(0.5) 0.2
Northwest Territories	(35.5) 46.8	(4.3) 3.3	(70.2) 49.8	(58.9) 73.2	(0.4) 0.2	(7.0) 6.0	(33.5) 20.3

Source: 1961 & 1971 Census of Canada, Statistics Canada,
Mother Tongue Population,
Catalogue No. 92-725.

Source: 1961 & 1971 Census of Canada, Statistics Canada,
Official Language and Language Most Often
Spoken at Home, Catalogue No. 92-726.

REGIONAL PATTERNS AND TRENDS

The extent to which the French origin and language population is concentrated in Canada can be seen in Table C-3, which shows that the Province of Quebec and the New Brunswick and Ontario counties on its borders account for 87% of Canada's French origin population; 93% of Canada's French mother-tongue population; 96% of Canada's residents who speak mostly French at home; 99.2% of those who speak French only; and 73.3% of Canada's population who are bilingual in English and French.

As noted above, Richard Joy and others who are interested primarily in regional variations in Official Language patterns aggregate the Census data in such a way as to highlight contrasts. In Tables C-4 to C-8 we follow the variations presented by Joy for eight Canadian regions, the make-up of which is described in a footnote to Table C-4. The distribution of the French origin and French language population for 1941 and 1971 is given for Joy's eight regions in that table. Especially notable are the shifts during that thirty-year period in the distribution of French origin, that percentage declining everywhere except for South and West Quebec, South and West Ontario, and British Columbia, reflecting the drawing power of these regions. In the case of the distribution of French language population, one can see in Table C-4 the growing concentration of that population in South and West Quebec.

Tables C-5 and C-6 show the changes between 1961 and 1971 in mother tongue and official language distributions. The largest percentage decreases in French mother tongue occurred in North and East Ontario and in the Prairies. Note the strong increase in 'Other' mother tongues in all parts of Ontario and the sharp drop in 'Other' mother tongues in the Prairies. The Prairies show a percentage decrease in Official Bilinguals, while the strongest increases in that category are in Northern New Brunswick, both parts of Ontario, and North and East Quebec.

Comparison of numbers of French origin and mother tongue who speak mostly French at home gives an idea of the extent to which in many parts of Canada a shift from French to English usage has occurred over the generations. Table C-7 shows that in the Province of Quebec there are slightly more French mother tongue than French origin, indicating a slight shift to the French there, as well as a virtual identity between the numbers of French mother tongue and French home language. However, the same table shows that, generally speaking, the farther from Quebec, the lower the percentage of French origin who report French mother tongue and the lower the percentage of the latter who speak mostly

French in the home. In fact, as is shown in Table C-8, for South and West Ontario, the Prairies, and British Columbia, French is spoken less often at home than are several 'Other' languages - that is, languages other than English and French. On the other hand, it is interesting to note that in Northern New Brunswick, French home language exceeds English home language.

FRENCH LANGUAGE ENCLAVES

There are several regions outside Quebec and the Bilingual Belt as described above where French-origin communities and neighbourhoods maintain varying degrees of language viability despite the presence of large English-speaking majorities surrounding them. French language viability is highest in the rural enclaves of long standing, more than a hundred of which are to be found in English-speaking regions. Examples are the small rural communities of Acadiens in the counties of Digby, Yarmouth and Richmond in Nova Scotia and in Prince county, Prince Edward Island; French-origin places in southern Manitoba and southern Saskatchewan as well as in the area surrounding Prince Albert; and in the area north and east of Edmonton in Alberta. Although French is still spoken in these rural enclaves, the language is on the decline in most of them as increasing numbers of young people adopt English as their usual language. Most of these communities are being depopulated and receive few, if any, French-speaking recruits through migration.

Even many of the Old French town and city enclaves are not being replenished with new French speakers to replace those lost through assimilation, death and migration. Like other people on the move in response to economic pressures, French-speakers in Canada flow towards rapidly developing metropolitan areas. Between 1961 and 1971, in English-speaking parts of Canada (i.e., outside Quebec and the Bilingual Belt) the French mother-tongue population increased anywhere from 40 to 75 percent in the metropolitan areas of Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Toronto, Hamilton, St. Catherine's-Niagara, Kitchener-London. In only a few of these places are there identifiable French-speaking neighbourhoods of long standing which could provide a communal and institutional base for French-language usage. In these large metropolitan areas, the French-speaking population is less than five percent of the total, usually outnumbered by other non-English mother tongue elements, such as German, Italian, Ukrainian.

Detailed demographic information on rural and urban enclaves outside Quebec and the Bilingual Belt may be gleaned from the 1971 Census of Canada, Volume I, Part 3.

**TABLE C-3 - MAJOR CONCENTRATIONS OF FRENCH "LANGUAGE POPULATIONS" IN CANADA
1971 CENSUS**

"Language populations"	1	2	3
	Québec	Québec & E. Ontario & N. New Brunswick	Québec & E. and N. Ontario & N. & E. New Brunswick
Ethnic Origin: French	77%	82%	87%
Mother Tongue: French	84%	91%	93%
Home Language: French	87%	94%	96%
Official Language: French Only	94%	97.6%	99.2%
Official Language Bilingual	57.4%	65.6%	73.3%

Note: Table courtesy Bilingual Districts Advisory Board

Column 1: Province of Québec

Column 2: Province of Québec & Stormont, Glengarry, Prescott-Russell,
Ottawa-Carleton (Ontario) & Madawaska, Restigouche, Gloucester,
Victoria (New Brunswick)

Column 3: As above plus: Renfrew, Nipissing, Sudbury, Timiskaming,
Cochrane, Algoma (Northern Ontario) & Northumberland, Kent,
Westmorland (New Brunswick)

**TABLE C-4 -- DISTRIBUTION OF THE "FRENCH" POPULATION OF CANADA
ACCORDING TO THE TWO CRITERIA OF ORIGIN AND LANGUAGE
BY REGIONS, 1941 AND 1971 CENSUSES**

REGION***	FRENCH BY ORIGIN		FRENCH BY LANGUAGE **	
	1941	1971	1941	1971
	in thousands of persons			
Atlantic *	100	137	61	41
Northern N.B.	153	208	151	192
N. & E. Québec	1,475	2,213	1,504	2,264
S. & W. Québec	1,220	2,546	1,213	2,607
N. & E. Ontario	238	398	218	281
S. & W. Ontario	136	339	71	72
Prairies	147	237	127	78
British Columbia	22	97	11	12
CANADA *	3,491	6,180	3,357	5,546
	as % of total for Canada			
Atlantic	2.9	2.2	1.8	0.7
Northern N.B.	4.4	3.4	4.5	3.5
N. & E. Québec	42.2	35.8	44.8	40.8
S. & W. Québec	35.0	41.2	36.1	47.0
N. & E. Ontario	6.8	6.4	6.5	5.1
S. & W. Ontario	3.9	5.5	2.1	1.3
Prairies	4.2	3.8	3.8	1.4
British Columbia	0.6	1.6	0.3	0.2

Source: Richard Joy, Language Trend Shown by Census Figures, unpublished paper presented at Conference on Language Issues, Concordia University (Loyola Campus), Montreal, April 1975. Correspondence may be addressed to the Author at: Box 2402, Station "D", Ottawa, K1P 5W5.

Notes: * Atlantic and Canada 1941 figures increased to reflect estimated French population of Newfoundland.

** "Language" is mother tongue in 1941 (first learned, still spoken) and home language is 1971. Thus these figures are rather rough estimates.

*** The eight regions delineated by Joy are made up as follows: The Atlantic Region includes all of Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, and P.E.I., plus the eight southern counties of New Brunswick. Northern New Brunswick includes seven counties: Gloucester, Kent, Madawaska, Northumberland, Restigouche, Victoria, and Westmoreland. The South and West of Quebec includes the Montreal Metropolitan Area and all the counties lying along the borders with Ontario, New York, Vermont, and New Hampshire, specifically: Abitibi, Argenteuil, Beauharnois, Brome, Chambly, Chateauguay, Compton, Deux-Montagnes, Gatineau, Hull, Huntingdon, Iberville, Laprairie, Missisquoi, Napierville, Papineau, Pontiac, Richmond, Rouville, St. John's, Shefford, Sherbrooke, Soulanges, Stanstead, Temiscamingue, Vaudreuil (the foregoing counties are included in their entirety); the Island of Montreal and Ile Jésus; and those parts of L'Assomption, Terrebonne, and Verchères counties which are within the Montreal Census Metropolitan Area. All the rest of Quebec Province falls within the third region, North and East Quebec. The North and East of Ontario includes eleven census division: Algoma, Cochrane, Glengarry, Nipissing, Ottawa-Carleton, Prescott, Renfrew, Russell, Stormont, Sudbury, and Timiskaming. The rest of Ontario falls within the sixth region, South and West Ontario. The other two regions, Prairies and British Columbia, have make-ups that are self-evident.

TABLE C-5 - POPULATION BY MOTHER TONGUE
IN EIGHT REGIONS IN CANADA
1961-1971

TABLE C-6 - POPULATION BY OFFICIAL LANGUAGE
EIGHT REGIONS IN CANADA
1961-1971

REGION	MOTHER TONGUE					OFFICIAL LANGUAGE					
	English		French		Other	English only		French only	Both	Neither	
	1961	1971	1961	1971	1961	1961	1971	1961	1971	1961	1971
Atlantic ¹	94.4	94.6	4.0	3.8	1.6	94.6	94.1	0.6	4.7	0.2	0.1
Northern N.B.	39.5	40.8	59.0	57.9	1.3	37.3	37.4	32.9	29.3	10.3	0.1
N. & E. Québec	3.1	2.9	95.8	96.0	0.9	1.9	1.5	84.2	13.5	0.1	0.3
S. & W. Québec	20.4	19.5	70.7	71.0	8.8	18.4	16.2	46.1	33.9	1.9	1.4
N. & E. Ontario	64.0	64.1	30.8	26.8	5.1	65.0	60.2	7.7	26.0	1.2	0.8
S. & W. Ontario	79.7	80.0	2.8	2.3	17.3	93.8	89.3	1.2	4.1	1.6	2.3
Prairies	68.7	73.7	4.3	3.9	27.0	91.7	92.4	0.8	7.4	1.6	1.4
British Columbia	80.9	82.7	1.6	1.7	17.5	95.3	94.0	0.2	3.5	1.0	1.2

Note: ¹Includes counties of New Brunswick where French MT population is less than 10%

Source: Derived and adapted from Joy, Op. Cit.

**TABLE C-7 - NUMBER OF PERSONS REPORTING FRENCH AS ETHNIC ORIGIN,
AS MOTHER TONGUE AND AS HOME LANGUAGE, FOR EACH OF THE
EIGHT REGIONS OF CANADA, 1971 CENSUS**

REGION	Total Population	French Ethnic Origin	French Mother Tongue	French Home Language
	Thousands of Persons			
Atlantic	1,711	137	65	41
Northern N.B.	346	208	201	192
N. & E. Québec	2,350	2,213	2,257	2,264
S. & W. Québec	3,677	2,546	2,611	2,607
N. & E. Ontario	1,228	398	330	281
S. & W. Ontario	6,475	339	152	72
Prairies	3,542	237	139	78
British Columbia	2,185	97	38	12
CANADA	21,568	6,180	5,794	5,546
REGION	% of Total Population in Each Region			
Atlantic	100	8.0	3.8	2.4
Northern N.B.	100	60.3	58.0	55.4
N. & E. Québec	100	94.2	96.0	96.3
S. & W. Québec	100	69.2	71.0	70.9
N. & E. Ontario	100	32.4	26.9	22.9
S. & W. Ontario	100	5.2	2.3	1.1
Prairies	100	6.7	3.9	2.2
British Columbia	100	4.4	1.7	0.5
CANADA	100	28.7	26.9	25.7

Source: Derived from Joy, Op. Cit. (1975)

**TABLE C-8 - POPULATION BY LANGUAGE MOST OFTEN SPOKEN AT HOME
EIGHT REGIONS OF CANADA
1971**

REGION	LANGUAGE MOST OFTEN SPOKEN AT HOME		
	English	French	Other
Atlantic	96.8	2.4	0.7
Northern N.B.	43.7	55.4	0.8
N. & E. Québec	2.9	96.3	0.7
S. & W. Québec	22.2	70.9	6.8
N. & E. Ontario	72.2	22.8	4.9
S. & W. Ontario	86.1	2.9	10.9
Prairies	88.2	2.2	9.5
British Columbia	92.7	0.5	6.6

Source: Derived from Joy, Op. Cit.

REGIONS OF FRENCH STRENGTH

Except for Table C-13, the remaining tables focus on regions where French is either the dominant language or (as in the so-called Bilingual Belt outside Quebec) where at least 30% of the population is of French mother tongue. They also separate from the other regions that of the Montreal Census Metropolitan Area, because of the unique language configurations there.

To mention a few highlights from Tables C-9 and C-10: French mother tongue and French only official language show declines in the Bilingual Belt. The French mother tongue population shows a slight increase in all Quebec regions since 1961, the most notable in the Montreal region. The only substantial increase in French only is in the Montreal Census Metropolitan Area. English mother tongue shows an increase since 1961 in the Bilingual Belt; elsewhere in the area under consideration it shows a decrease, especially in the Montreal Census Metropolitan region. In the latter region the 'Other' mother tongues show a slight increase since 1961. In the regions under consideration in these tables, the English only shows a decrease, except in the Bilingual Belt. Worth noting is the increase throughout the area under consideration in numbers officially bilingual and the general decline in those who report neither English nor French.

While it is true that the proportion of people of French mother tongue who are bilingual is higher than that for English mother tongue for Canada as a whole, there are some interesting trends suggested for the region under consideration. Especially noteworthy is the substantial increase in those of non-French mother tongue who are officially bilingual. These changes can be seen in Table C-11. Finally, Table C-12 gives some idea of the contrasts in home language proportions as between the different regions of Quebec and the Bilingual Belt lying outside that Province.

In making projections about future trends in language maintenance and shift, the ethnic and language characteristics of children provide crucial information. Richard Joy's analysis, contained in Tables C-13 and C-14, when coupled with what we know about declining fertility among the French in Quebec and the small additions to the Francophone population by immigration, presents a disturbing picture for those who are concerned with the maintenance of the French language, even in Quebec. As an example of how little the Francophones gain from international immigration, Table C-15 shows that, for 1973, the two categories of language which were most numerous among international immigrants to Quebec were English only and neither French nor English.

TABLE C-9 - LANGUAGE TRENDS IN SELECTED REGIONS
OF QUEBEC AND THE BILINGUAL BELT
1961-1971

TABLE C-10 - LANGUAGE TRENDS IN SELECTED REGIONS
OF QUEBEC AND THE BILINGUAL BELT
1961-1971

REGIONS	MOTHER TONGUE POPULATION				OFFICIAL LANGUAGE POPULATION					
	English		French		French only		Both		Neither	
	1961	1971	1961	1971	1961	1971	1961	1971	1961	1971
Bilingual Belt (Outside Québec)	55.3	58.9	36.1	33.7	58.6	13.7	11.3	26.8	29.2	0.6
N. & E. Québec	3.1	2.9	95.8	96.0	1.5	84.2	82.6	13.5	15.5	0.2
S. & W. Québec	20.4	19.5	70.7	71.0	16.2	46.1	46.9	33.9	35.3	1.5
S. & W. Québec (excluding Montreal Census Metropolitan Area)	13.8	13.2	83.8	84.7	9.4	61.1	60.1	27.5	30.0	0.3
Montreal Census Metropolitan Area	23.4	21.7	64.7	66.3	18.5	39.1	42.4	36.8	37.0	1.9

TABLE C-11 - FRENCH MOTHER TONGUE BILINGUALS
AND NON-FRENCH MOTHER TONGUE BILINGUALS
IN THE BILINGUAL BELT AND QUEBEC
1961-1971

REGION	French Mother Tongue Bilingual		Non-French Mother Tongue Bilingual	
	1961	1971	1961	1971
Bilingual Belt (Outside Québec)	61.9	64.9	6.9	12.3
N. & E. Québec	12.1	13.0	50.3	55.9
S. & W. Québec	34.8	33.9	30.3	38.6
S. & W. Québec (Excluding Montreal Census Metropolitan Area)	27.0	28.9	23.3	35.5
Montreal Census Metropolitan Area	39.5	36.0	31.8	39.1

TABLE C-12 - LANGUAGE MOST OFTEN SPOKEN AT HOME
IN THE BILINGUAL BELT AND QUEBEC
1971

REGION	HOME LANGUAGE POPULATION		
	English	French	Other
Bilingual Belt (Outside Québec)	65.9	30.0	4.0
N. & E. Québec	2.9	96.3	0.7
S. & W. Québec	22.2	70.9	6.8
S. & W. Québec (excluding Montreal Census Metropolitan Area)	14.3	84.3	1.2
Montreal Census Metropolitan Area	24.9	66.3	8.7

Sources: Tables C-9 to C-12 are derived chiefly from Joy, op. cit., but also from preliminary data from the Bilingual Districts Advisory Board and from various Census sources.

**TABLE C-13 - FRANCOPHONE CHILDREN AGED 0-4
LIVING OUTSIDE QUEBEC
CENSUSES OF 1941-1971**

Province	1941	1951	1961	1971
Ontario	31,000	40,000	48,000	32,000
New Brunswick	21,000	31,000	29,000	19,000
Elsewhere	18,000	19,000	19,000	10,000
as Percentage of total 0-4 population				
	%	%	%	%
Ontario	10.5	7.7	6.5	5.0
New Brunswick	42.5	41.3	37.5	32.5
Elsewhere	5.2	3.3	2.4	1.6

Note: According to the 1971 figures for Language of the Home:
 Anglophones 0-4 in Québec = 61,345
 Francophones outside Québec = 60,830

Source: Joy, *op. cit.*

**TABLE C-14 - LANGUAGE DISTRIBUTION AMONG CHILDREN
AGED 0-4 LIVING IN QUEBEC
1941-1971**

Language	1941	1951	1961	1971
French	312,000	468,000	564,000	391,000
English	33,000	64,000	79,000	61,000
Other	9,000	9,000	29,000	28,000
as percentage of total 0-4 population				
	%	%	%	%
French	88.3	86.5	83.9	81.3
English	9.2	11.2	11.8	12.8
Other	2.5	1.7	4.3	5.9

Source: Joy, *op. cit.*

**TABLE C-15
IMMIGRATION INTO QUEBEC BY OFFICIAL LANGUAGES
1973**

Country	TOTAL		FRENCH ONLY		ENGLISH ONLY		BOTH		NEITHER	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Africa	1,396	5.2	602	43.1	345	24.7	335	24.0	114	8.1
America	9,068	33.7	2,199	24.2	4,972	54.8	1,060	11.6	837	9.2
Asia	4,247	15.8	433	10.2	2,274	53.5	422	9.9	1,118	26.3
Europe	11,667	43.4	2,098	17.9	3,333	28.5	1,154	9.8	5,082	43.5
Oceania	145	0.5	1	0.6	128	88.2	15	10.3	1	0.6
TOTAL	26,871	100.0	5,372	19.9	11,240	41.8	3,018	11.2	7,241	26.9

Source: Bulletin Spécial No. 1,
 Annexe au bulletin statistique annuel, 1973,
 Ministère de l'Immigration - Gouvernement du Québec.

The Tables C-16, C-17 and C-18 have been derived from a special cross-classification of census data commissioned by the Bilingual Districts Advisory Board.* They are intended to indicate, for the City of Montreal and for the Montreal Census Metropolitan Area, the contribution of non-official language groups to the Official Languages. This is a controversial issue and, because there are severe limitations to the value of these statistics, they should be used with caution. The Montreal Census Metropolitan Area comprises over 30 separate cities and the character of those cities and the area as a whole varies from that of Montreal City proper.

Table C-16 compares the City of Montreal proper with the Montreal Census Metropolitan Area. It shows that the CMA has a considerably higher proportion of English mother tongue and home language than does the City proper. The latter has slightly higher percentages of French mother tongue, home language, and French only than the CMA. The 'Other' mother tongue, home language and neither English nor French population are significantly higher in the City than in the CMA.

Turning to the language use patterns of the 'Other' mother tongue groups in the City of Montreal, Tables C-17 and C-18 show that there is a definite preference for English over French for most 'Other' language populations. This is seen most clearly in the home language figures of Table C-17. Exceptions to this general rule are the Italian and Portuguese groups who, of all the language groups for which we have census data, tend to lean the least to the English as home language. We should note that the census data available do not provide information on certain small populations who would lean more to the French than to the English languages (e.g., French speaking people from countries in North Africa, West Africa, and the West Indies). These figures provide some understanding of the reasons underlying certain provisions of Bill 22.

* The Report of the Second Bilingual Districts Advisory Board appeared in October 1975, after this Data Book was completed. The tables in the Data Book derived from materials used by the Board were constructed by DeVries and Vallee and are not to be regarded as having been published by the Board.

TABLE C-16

MONTREAL CENSUS METROPOLITAN AREA
(Figures for MONTREAL CITY indicated in brackets)

ETHNIC GROUP	PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION					
	MOTHER TONGUE		HOME LANGUAGE		OFFICIAL LANGUAGE	
French	66.3	(66.9)	66.3	(67.5)	French Only	42.4 (43.2)
English	21.7	(15.2)	24.9	(18.5)	English Only	18.5 (15.5)
Italian	4.7	(7.7)	3.9	(6.2)	Both	37.0 (37.7)
Greek	1.3	(2.4)	1.2	(2.0)	Neither	1.9 (3.4)
German	0.9	(0.7)	0.4	(0.2)		
Yiddish	0.7	(1.1)	0.4	(0.5)		
Magyar	0.4	(0.5)	0.3	(0.3)		
Ukrainian	0.3	(0.5)	0.2	(0.3)		

CMA Total population - 2,743,235
Montreal City - 1,214,380

TABLE C-17

CONTRIBUTIONS BY MOTHER TONGUE TO OFFICIAL LANGUAGES
AND HOME LANGUAGES: MONTREAL CITY

MOTHER TONGUE	Total Number	OFFICIAL LANGUAGE				HOME LANGUAGE			
		French Only	English Only	Both	Neither	French	English	Mother Tongue (MT=HL)	Other
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
French	812,540	61.1 ¹	—	38.8	—	97.4	2.1	(97.4)	0.4
English	185,755	—	61.2	38.7	—	90.7	6.2	(90.7)	3.0
Italian	94,060	22.2	14.6	37.6	25.3	9.3 ²	9.3	81.0 ³	0.3 ⁴
Greek	30,175	1.8	54.4	15.0	28.5	1.7	11.4	84.3	2.4
German	9,480	4.6	55.0	37.2	3.0	9.4	47.8	37.5	5.0
Yiddish	13,365	1.0	63.8	31.7	3.2	1.7	49.5	46.3	2.3
Magyar	7,160	3.9	59.4	29.5	7.0	4.1	28.6	62.3	4.8
Ukrainian	6,150	2.8	51.7	39.1	6.1	4.2	25.1	68.5	2.0

¹ This figure indicates that 61.1% of those whose mother tongue is French have French only as their official language.

³ This figure indicates that 81.0% of those whose mother tongue is Italian speak Italian in the home.

² This figure indicates that 9.3% of those whose mother tongue is Italian now speak French in the home.

⁴ This figure indicates that 0.3% of those whose mother tongue is Italian speak neither English nor French nor Italian in the home.

TABLE C-18

OFFICIAL LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE: MONTREAL CITY

MOTHER TONGUE = HOME LANGUAGE	Official Language			
	French Only	English Only	Both	Neither
Italian	22.3*	13.7	32.6	31.4
Greek	1.3	52.8	12.6	33.3
German	1.4	62.6	29.3	6.7
Yiddish	0.6	73.8	18.9	6.7
Magyar	2.6	61.4	25.6	10.3
Ukrainian	2.6	55.3	33.2	8.2
Portuguese	20.8	21.4	39.7	18.0

* This figure indicates that where Italian is the Home Language and the Mother Tongue, 22.3% have French as the only official language.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ANALYSES
OF OFFICIAL LANGUAGE PATTERNS AND TRENDS

- BILINGUAL DISTRICTS ADVISORY BOARD, Report, 1975, Ottawa:
Information Canada.
- CASTONGUAY, Charles et MARION, Jacques, L'anglicisation du Canada, Bulletin de l'Association des démographes du Québec, Vol. 3, No. 1, mars 1974.
- HENRIPIN, Jacques, L'avenir des francophones au Canada, Memoires de la Société royale du Canada, IV, XIII, 1975.
- JOY, Richard, Languages in Conflict, McClelland and Stewart, Toronto, 1972.
- JOY, Richard, Language Trends Shown by the Census Figures, Unpublished paper presented at the Conference on Language and Community, Concordia University, Montreal, April 5, 1975. (Copies available at author's mailing address: Box 2402, Station "D", Ottawa, Ontario, K1P 5W5).
- LIEBERSON, Stanley, Language and Ethnic Relations in Canada, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1970.
- MAHEU, Robert, Les Francophones du Canada, 1941-1991, Parti-Pris, Montréal, 1970.
- MAHEU, Robert, L'avenir des groupes linguistiques du Québec: l'aspect démographique, Bulletin de l'Association des démographes du Québec, Vol. 2, spécial 2, 1973.
- GENDRON COMMISSION, Reports including studies done for it. Ministère des Communications, Québec, 1974.
- ROYAL COMMISSION ON BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM, especially Book I on Official Languages (Queen's Printer, 1968).
- VALLEE, Frank G. and DUFOUR, Albert, The Bilingual Belt: a Garrotte for the French? in Guy BERNARD, Ed., Bilinguisme, lance ou défi? Special Issue of Laurentian University Review, Vol. VI.2, February 1974.

3 1761 11465487 4

